

ANTI-SOZZO-

SIVE

Sherlocismus Enervatus:

I N

VINDICATION

OF SOME

Great TRUTHS Opposed,

AND

OPPOSITION

TO SOME

Great ERRORS Maintained

B Y

Mr. WILLIAM SHERLOCK.

By Vincent Alsop V.D.M.

1 Cor. 16. 22.

*If any Man love not the Lord Jesus Christ, let him
be Anathema Maranatha.*

L O N D O N,

Printed for Nathaniel Powder at the Sign of the Pea-
cock in the Poultry near Corn-Hill, and in Chan-
cery Lane near Fleetstreet, 1676.

ANTI-SLAVO

1712

Specimens of

VINDICATION

OF THE

OPINION

OF THE

AMERICAN

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

to
na
do
su
cy
Ca
m
m
sty
co
to
I
pe
K
Ca

The PREFACE.

Christian Reader,

SINCE the Great Tyrant Custom, has made every one that shall dare to Write, a Debtor to every one that shall please to Read, and obliged him under no less penalty than the forfeiture of his Readers Candour, and falling foul upon his severe displeasure, to render a Reason of his Scripturien-
cy; that I may not seem to stem the violent Current of this inveterate and prevailing Humour, by a sullen moroseness, I shall suffer my self silently to be carryed down with the stream, so far as to give thee this short Account of those Motives which won me over to this Undertaking.

In the Printed Catalogue of Books, 1674. I met with One, wearing the glorious Superscription of *A Discourse concerning the Knowledge of Jesus Christ, and our Union and Communion with him*: By W. S. And I did

A 2

seriously

The Preface.

seriously rejoyce, to see those who are Adorned with the Honourable Name of *Ministers of the Gospel*, so profitably employ those Hours which they borrow from Publick Service, as to travel in so necessary a Subject. Now as this was *the only Reason* of my first Ambition to be found amongst his Readers; so perhaps I am not the first that has been *decoyed* by a *specious glittering Title*, to place out precious Time upon Disappointments; for I must freely confess, how ashamed I was of my ill-spent pains, when I found *pro Thesauris, Carbones*; not many Barley-Corns, but *not one Jewel* in all that Dunghill.

I was willing at first to suspect, that happily through some Oversight, either in the *Collator*, or *Binder*, a *wrong Title-page* had been præfixt to the *Book*; so irreconcilable did the Enmity seem between them; but second thoughts informed me, that *the Title* did not oblige the *Book* to Treat of the *True Knowledge of Christ*, nor to acquaint us wherein our *Union to, and Communion with him*, did really consist; for, provided, *The Discourse* was managed concerning these things, though in *Reproach* of them, or in *Opposition* to them, yet it was enough to *justifie* its Harmony with, and *make good* whatever

The Preface.

whatever was explicitly promised in *The Bill of Fare*.

But whatever my Apprehensions were about that, I found many difficulties to remove, and great discouragements to get over, before I could perswade my self, to give the Author the Contentment, or the World the Trouble, of this Answer.

The first and greatest that presented it self, was, from my own Inexperience and want of skill, dexterously to handle the Polemical Saw: But yet I was help'd over that Block by a temptation, that softly whisper'd, I must never hope for a more encouraging Piece to enter a Novice, or flesh a junior Disputant. For though it be not the Priviledge of every one, with the great Hercules, to strangle Serpents in his Cradle, yet a Child may serve to kill Flies, as well as the Mighty Domitian. But I was more daunted at that Huffing Confidence, wherewith he Heſtors his low-spirited Readers into Obsequiousness, challenging the whole World, at all Weapons, from the Spanish Needle to the long Pike and upwards; and yet amongst them all, I felt not the weight of Goliath's Weavers Beam. His discourse indeed proceeds in Cavalcade, like the Ceremonious Train of Bernice, *μετὰ πολλῆς φαντασίας*, with glorious
A 3 Pomp

The Preface:

Pomp and Gallantry, but when I had rallyed up so much Courage, as might make me once dare to look his Arguments in the Face, truly I found nothing but a *Gyants skin stust with straw*, or the Guts of an old War-Saddle; such as might well affright any, but would kill no living thing: Methought I saw how the poor terrified Frogs trembled at the first Appearance of *Jupiters Viceroy Log*, but when they had retrieved their scattered spirits, and came to examine the Reasons of their Consternation, they soon made that the Object of their Scorn, which had been so lately the Cause of their Terror. It minded me too of that little Policy of the great Alexander, who, to impress the Dread of his Name and Arms upon the Indians, formed such a Camp, that none but the wide-stradling *Rhodian Colossus* could look over the Breast-works; and left such exalted Mangers behind him, as would have sterved his own *Eucephalus*, such as must presume every Horse in the Army to have been a *Pegasus*. But yet my poor Labours might well plead a Writ of Ease, from the weakness of his Reasonings, which would hardly proselyte any, but those who were half-curdled; nor infect any with that *Nōnē mēi Zētōus, ē λογμαχίας*, but such who were already in *Latitudine Morbi*:
But

The Preface.

But I consider'd withall, that *weak persons* are mortally *strong* when they encounter *weaker constitutions*, and there are not many who (with *Mithridates*) carry *Antidotes* in their *Complexion*. This last Age has given us plain demonstration, that *Noyse, Clamour and Confidence*, with a *small sprinkling of Rhetorick*, are Charms able to over-set *ductile and sequacious Natures*; and the *Eagles* complaint has taught us, that the *Beetles* enmity ought not to be despised. But I was superseded a while by a more weighty Consideration; That they who *superintend Ecclesiastical Affairs*, would doubtless interpose, and bestow a deserved Trimming upon the Book, and make it doe *Penance* in its own sheets, which had so openly defiled its own Mother, exposed her avowed Principles; but withall it was my Duty to consider, that *Non vacat exiguis rebus adesse* — *Greatness and Smallness*, are two Circumstances of Beings, which render them *less Visible*: Thus we cannot take a view of the *World*, because it's too *Bulky*; nor of an *Atome*, because it's too *Minute* an Object for the sight: And possibly from one of these Accidents it was, that his Book walks *invisible*, and (as under the Protection of *Gyges his Ring*) has hitherto escaped the Cognizance of Authority.

The Preface.

Such were my *Remora's* ; but now whether those *Inducements* which lay before me, might out-weigh these *Discouragements*, and be sufficient to turn the scale of an *equipoiz'd Judgement* ; I must leave to the better judgement of the impartial Reader.

And, (1) The *Comprehensiveness* of many of his *Errours*, called aloud for *Preservatives* : I saw the *Offices* of Christ, so confounded, ravelled, and mangled, that it was impossible to discern the *Acts* of the *Prophetical*, from those of the *Regal* ; and the proper *Employment* of either of them, from that of the *Sacerdotal* ; I saw the great and glorious *Ends* of the *Death* of Christ, *vacated* and *cashiered* ; I saw the *Work* of the *Holy Spirit* in *Regeneration* *scorned* and *denyed* : Now the *Historian* tells us, There were in *uno Casare decem Marii* ; the *Ambition* of ten such as *Marius* in *One Caesar* : And others tell us, that *Serpens cum Serpente devorat, fit Draco* ; when a *Serpent* swallows a *Serpent*, he becomes a *Dragon* : What then could we expect less than *Legion* from the *Teeming Womb* of such *Big-bellied Monsters* ? For though in point of *Argument*, his *Mountain* is often delivered of a *Mouse* ; yet in point of *Error*, his *Mouse* alwayes brings forth a *Mountain*.

(2) It

The Preface.

(2) It was a Spur to my duller Temper, to Observe how he had raked all the *Kennels* and *common Sewers* of *Friendly Debates*, *Ecclesiastical Politics*, (which, with *Martial Law*, and *Civil War*, make up the *Four great Solæcismes* of this last Age) and borrowed *Auxiliaries* from the *Scavenger*, to compose an *Oleo*, to throw in the *Faces* of the *Innocent*; some of the particulars the Reader will find *wiped off* by these *Papers*, and returned with *that Correction and Chastisement*, which it became me to give them, though not with what they deserved to Receive: but for *souling* my fingers with them all, I must beg *Excuse*; it had been a work no less *irksome and tedious*, than the *cleansing of Augæa's Stable*, and no otherwise to be effected, than by *Letting in the Thames* from *Billings-gate* through *Buttolph-lane*. Yet one Instance of the Many omitted (and one is *too much for a Taste*) I shall here give the Reader, hoping it may *not turn his stomach* against the Rest: *Dr. Owen*, *Com. p. 177.* has said: *By the Obedience of Christ, I intend the universal Conformity of the Lord Jesus Christ (as he was or is in his being Mediator) to the whole Will of God, &c. Now this Obedience of Christ, (N. B. as Mediator) may be considered two ways. I. As to the habitual Root and Foun-*
tain

The Preface.

tain of it. 2. As to the Actual parts and Duties of it. 1. The habitual Righteousness of Christ as Mediator, (N. B. p. 178.) in his Humane Nature, was the absolute, complete, exact Conformity of the Soul of Christ to the Will, Mind, or Law of God. 2. The Actual Obedience of Christ, was his willing, chearful, obediential Performance of every Thing, Duty or Command, that God by vertue of any Law whereto we were subject, did require; and, Moreover, to the Peculiar Law of the Mediator: Hereof there are two parts: 1. That whatever was required of us, by the Law of Nature, &c. He did it all. 2. There was the Peculiar Law of the Mediator, which respected himself Merely, and contained all those Acts and Duties which are not for our Imitation: Thus far the Doctor. But now what a world of wit has our Author shewn upon this Occasion, or rather no Occasion? Declaiming for four, five, or six pages together, upon the Trite and Common Theme of his own Ignorance; pag. 298, 299, 300, 301, 302, 303. So that by the Law of Mediation (sayes he) He understands whatever Christ was bound to doe as our Mediator, whatever was proper to his Mediatory Office; All this is not imputed to us, as though we had done it; I hope we shall find something at last to be imputed to us; but

The Preface.

but there's nothing left now, but (thirdly) that which concerns him in a Private Capacity, as a Man, subject to the Law. Now had this Gentleman been pleased to have understood the Doctor a little before he had pretended to Consult him, he might have seen, that He supposes, 1. A general Law of the Mediator, whereby he gave Obedience to the Law of Nature, &c. in our stead: 2. The peculiar Law of the Mediator, which respected himself merely; to this he gave not Obedience in our stead: But still, whatever Obedience he performed, 'twas as Mediator, though not according to the peculiar Law of the Mediator: But alas, this would have spoyled a great deal of excellent Wit, and dear Drollery, which no man, engaged in a Design of Railery and Scolding, would willingly lose for a World; especially when he was practising (like the great Balsac, in some of his Letters,) to make an Experiment, what The Height of forced Fancy can produce out of a barren and dry Subject, or placing his Draining Engines to Recover the Boggs and Fenns upon New-Market Heath.

(3) His Subtle and Politick Method of venting Blasphemies, was that which mainly pressed me to this Service: For it's now grown the solemn Mode of this Tribe of Men,

The Preface.

Men, to vomit out the most opprobrious Language against the Lord and his Christ, and then to wash their hands in Pilate's Innocency, by saying, *These are the Consequences of other Mens Opinions*: And herein lies this Authors singular Excellency, and proper Talent. Thus when some affirm, That God is a Holy God, a Righteous Governour, a Just Judge, who will by no means clear the Guilty, one that will not fail to recompense to every man according to his Works; and yet in infinite Wisdom and Mercy has made Provision in the Death of his Son, for securing the Glory, both of his Essential and Restoral Righteousness; that he may be (and appear to be) just, and the Justifier of him that Believes in Jesus. You shall now guess at the Lyon by his Claw, and see what nasty, dirty, filthy stuffe, he can extract out of this Doctrine. Pag. 46. *The Justice of God hath glutted it self with Revenge in the Death of Christ, and so henceforward we may be sure he will be very kind, as a Revengefull man is, when his Passion is over.* And pag. 47. *The summe of which is this; That God is all Love and Patience, when he has taken his fill of Revenge, as others use to say, the Devil is very good when he is pleased.* Again, whereas the Church of England, Art. 17. has express'd
her

The Preface.

her Conceptions about Predestination, in these words: Predestination to life is the everlasting Purpose of God, whereby, before the Foundation of the World was laid, he hath constantly decreed by his Council, secret to us, to deliver from Curse and Damnation, those whom he hath chosen in Christ out of Mankind, and to bring them by Christ to Everlasting Salvation: Our Author is pleased to droll upon this Tremendous Mystery at this pleasant Rate. Pag. 57. This falls hard upon those miserable Wretches, whose ill Fortune it was, without any fault of theirs, to be left out of the Roll of Election. Thus when one had ventured to say, by Warrant from Christ's own Mouth, John 3. 14. That Christ was compared to the Brazen Serpent, &c. He comes in with this sneering Droll, p. 115. Who can forbear being smitten with so lovely a Person? In all which, and a hundred times more, we are bound to suppose, That there is, *Nihil bonis moribus contrarium quò minus cum publicâ Utilitate Imprimatur.* Now if no Reverence of the Majesty of God, no Regard to the Authority of the Holy Scriptures, no Respect to the Harmonious Confessions of Faith of All Protestant Churches, could oblige his Pen to observe a due Temperament, yet methinks,

The Preface.

thinks, *Civility to that Church* whereof He is a Member, which has not been *Uncivil to him*, and may exercise *more kindness to him*, might have commanded more becoming Language, about those things wherein she has declared her Judgement: And I will not conceal it, This was one thing that quickned me to undertake this Province; when I saw how readily some men could snatch the Pen to under-write, what with the same Hand, and Pen, and Breath, they intended to Confute; or if not to Confute, yet however to Deride. Upon a serious Reflection on these things, Remembring (somewhere) a Passage of Austin, That he would have every man that can hold a Pen, write against Pelagius, that sworn Enemy to the Free, Discriminating and Effectual Grace of God; and Remembring also the Command of the Apostle Jude, v. 3. To contend earnestly for the Faith once delivered to the Saints; I thought we had as good a License to plead for Christ, and his Truth, here at the Footstool, who pleads for us, according to his Truth, upon the Throne; as any man can pretend to plead against them. And therefore to deal Freely with my Reader, I judg'd it my Duty, rather to lament than imitate that Deep and

and
conce
Wor
to th
moun
A po
ficial
Whe
daye
this
to b
app
thor
stian
Jesu
abo
and
An
Peg
Pol
mon
Rig
fice
Goe
in t
W
W
pro
Ge

The Preface.

and Dead Silence of those who are *equally* concern'd with, and *better qualified* for the Work, than my self; to give some Cheek to this growing Petulancy, and sawcy Humour, of daily encroaching Prophaneness: A poor Man came once to a Learned Physician for Advice; but first he would know, *Whether it was safe to take Physick in Dog-dayes?* His Physician replyed no more but this: *If it be lawfull to be sick, it's lawfull to be well at any time of the Year.* I shall apply it no further than this: If this Author be *qualified to oppose*, every true Christian is *qualified to Defend* the Gospel of Jesus Christ: For the Dispute is not now about Decency and Order, about Fringes and Philacteries, about the tything of Mint, Anise, or Cummine; nor about a Pin or Peg in the Superstructure of the Churches Polity; nor about the three Innocent Ceremonies; but about *The Influence of the Righteousness of Christs Life, and the Sacrifice of his Death upon our Acceptance with God*; about the Interest of the Blessed Spirit in the glorious Work of the *New Creation*; *Whether Christ be a proper Priest or no?* *Whether as a Priest he Offer'd himself as a proper Sacrifice to God or no?* *Whether God and Man are Reconciled, and we Redeemed*

The Preface.

deemed from the Curse of the Law by the Blood of Jesus or no? Whether we are Justified, before the Just and Holy God, by our own Righteousness, or by the Righteousness of a Mediator? And in a word, Whether the Death of Christ be the proper and immediate Cause of any one single Blessing, great or small, of the Covenant of Grace? In which, the Concerns, all the Eternal Hopes of every Christian, are wrapt up; and wherein that he may not mistake, and so Finally miscarry, as 'tis the unfeigned Design of these Papers, so 'tis the Earnest Prayer of

READER,

Thy Servant in the Gospel
of our Lord and Saviour
JESUS CHRIST,

N. N.

CHAP.

CHAP. I.

*Containing an Answer to the First Chapter,
concerning the Name Christ, The Offices of
Christ, &c.*

IT was a *Question* stated by the *Curious*, Why *Homer* should begin his *Iliads* with *Misus*? and the *Answer* had a *spice* of the same *vanity*, because (forsooth) *Anger* is *blind*. Let none be so *Hypercritical*, as to enquire, Why our *Author* commences his *Discourse*, with, *ALL ERROR*? nor any so *hasty* to *Reply*; Because he intends to *continue* the *Metaphor*, and carry on the *Humour* proportionably to the *End*; but hear him out, *All Error* hath some *Appearance* of *Truth*; to which if you shall adde, and -- *All Truth* may have some *Appearance* of *Error*. You have then his *Syllabus Capitum*; the *Marrow* and *Contents* of five long *Chapters*, with their *Sections*, *Paragraphs*, and goodly *Periods* spun out into *Four hundred thirty and two Pages*. The whole dividing it self into these two general *Heads*, *Blanching* of *Heresie*, and *Smutting* of *Truth*.

The *Gentleman* *Alwayes* took it for granted, that *Christ* and his *Religion* were very well agreed, and he is still of the same *Mind*, that his *Person* is not

at Odds with his Gospel; but it seems there are some, who have made as irreconcilable a difference betwixt the Religion of Christs Person, and of his Gospel, as between the Law and Grace, p. 3. It was no smaller a Name than that of the great Socrates, who curst the Man, whoever he was, that first distinguished between *Bonum Utile*, and *Honestum*; and I must confess, I have no small Pike against that Generation of Men, who have made Two Religions of one, and then set them both together by the Ears; Whether there be any such on this side Utopia, I shall not determine; but this I will; 'Tis highly expedient, nay absolutely necessary, that some such there should be, for else what will become of all that heavy Dingo, our Author has raised upon that one Supposition? and with what a ruefull Clutter will the Superstructure fall upon the Head of the Architect, who has rear'd it full five stories high, upon that single Hypothesis? To prevent which fatal Inconvenience, I would humbly Advise the Persons concern'd in the Charge, to plead Guilty to the Indulgent, (if they may do it with a good Conscience) and not to be so uncivil and disingenuous as to render an Excellent Author, Ridiculous: And yet if what he tells us be true. That the Gospel of Christ be as severe a Dispensation as the Law, I see not what Great Disparagement it can prove to the Religion of his Person and his Gospel, to be at as great a Fend, as the Law and Grace. A mistake then there is somewhere or other, which though we poor, dull Mortals could not discover, our Authors piercing Eye had soon observ'd the ground of it, viz. That some men, wherever they meet the word [Christ] always understand by it the Person of Christ, p. 4. That was

was
this
and
liver
Impo
justi
Fai
Rel
trad
very
vate
he
on,
fition
Eva
spel
Per
and
Chr
Obe
Pla
enc
loa
of
sing
ing
us
wh
Wo
the
Se
N

was the *known* *Leads*, it seems, the Spring of all this mischief; And if they do not so *understand*, and *misunderstand* to boot, there's no way to Deliver *Hu Discourse*, from two little, silly Scapes of *Impertinency* and *Superfluity*; nor any warrant to justify the reviling of those Men, for expounding, *Faith in Christ*, and *Hope in Christ*, of a *fiducial Relyance* and *Recumbency on Christ's Person*, in *contradistinction* to *Obedience to his Laws*. For the very truth is (as I shall acquaint my Reader privately betwixt him and me,) Those Persons whom he reflects upon with so much *Wornfull Indignation*, do not in the least urge *Faith in Christ*, in opposition to *Obedience*; onely they judge, That an *Evangelical Obedience* to the *Commands* of the *Gospel*, must as *indispensibly* follow *Faith in Christ's Person*, as it must necessarily precede *Eternal Life* and *Salvation*, revealed, promised and purchased by *Christ*: It's no Question then with *Them*, Whether *Obedience to the Gospel*, shall have a *Place*; a *great Place*; but what is the *Proper place* of that *Obedience*? But this I speak onely under the *Rose*, being loath to nip the blossoming hopes I have conceived of his *Abilities*, in the *Bud*, or to Blemish so promising a *Work* in the *Frontispiece*.

Our Author having once oblig'd us, by discovering the *Origen* of this *Mistake*, is resolv'd to load us with a *second obligation*, by rectifying it. For which purpose, though he has many wayes to the *Wood*, yet the very best way of All is, to *Examine* the various significations of this Name [*Christ*] in *Scripture*.

First he assures us, that [*Christ*] is *Originally* the *Name of an Office*. The *Name of an Office*, and

Originally the Name of an Office too ! To which I on'y whisper softly in his Ear ; It's neither the one nor the other ; not the Name, much less Originally the Name of an Office. The Hebrew word *Messiah* (to which the Greek *Xeuds* exactly answers) denotes a Person Anoynted, and thereby set apart for some special work or service. And I dare be judg'd by this Gentleman himself, if it be not so : For in the same sentence, with the same breath wherewith he had told us, that *Christ is Originally the Name of an Office*, he immediately adds, *which the Jews call the Messiah, or one Anoynted by God*. And now sure the Controversie will be brought into a narrow compass : Whether He whom the Jews call the *Messiah*, or one Anoynted of God, be a Person or an Office ? that is, Whether a Person be a Person or no ? but it's not for me to determine so weighty a Point. And therefore the Gentleman himself, who is a fair Disputer, and no imperious Dictator, shall give you a Reason why he contradicts his own Assertion ; wherein he is the rather to be believed, because he speaks with so becoming a proof of credibility, that to confirm a Truth he confutes himself : For (saith he) under the Law, their Prophets, Priests, and Kings, were invested in their several Offices by the Ceremony of Anoynting them with Oyl. Not to mention what a profound Observation he has made, becoming his Good Learning ; nor how little need he had to Transcribe it from *Vulkelius, lib. 3. de verâ Relig. c. 2. p. 41. Propterea quod O'im, tum Sacerdotes, Varésque, tum Reges per Unctionis Religionem, atque Ceremoniam muneribus suis initiabantur*. All Ordinary People would conclude, that Kings, Priests, and Prophets, signifie, not Offices in the Abstract,

strait, but Persons, very Persons, real, errant Persons, as any are under the Sun, vested with their several and respective Offices, in the Concrete, as your systematical men love to speak. And therefore if our Authors Reason reaches the Thing it pretends to evince; Christ, the Messiah will not signifie an Office, but a Person authorised by his Office, for the discharge of those Employments, his Eternal Father had anoynted and appointed him unto.

But how shall we know *whom* or *what* the Jews called the *Messiah*? The very best way that I know, is to single out those Places in the Old Testament, where *Messiah*, or the *Anoynted one*, is found, and let the Gentleman practise upon them, with all the critical skill and cunning he is guilty of, and see how he can wire-draw Office out of them, *Pf. 2. 2. The Rulers take Counsel against the Lord, and against his Anoynted, וְעַל מְשִׁיחוֹ*: Against his *Messias*, or against his *Christ*: It would be harsh to Render it, *against his Office*. Whatever it was, it is called *Gods King*, v. 6. and *Gods Son*, v. 7. and whether it was a *Person* or an *Office* that will bear those Titles, I shall referre to his determination. *Dan. 9. 25. Messiah the Prince, מְשִׁיחַ נָגִיד*: *V. 26. The Messiah shall be cut off, but not for himself; was it an Office that was cut off? though not for Himself?* So that this *New Notion*, dwindles away into a fine *New-Nothing*, which is a thousand pities: It would doubtless have served his turn at many a *dead list* in the ensuing debates; however it was *advisedly done*, and upon *mature deliberation*, that he favour'd us not with one *single Text*, to prove that wherein the Scripture professes a *deep silence*.

It has been accounted very *ominous* to *stumble at the Threshold*, and whilest he layes it down as a *superliminary Maxim*, That *All Error has some*, yet to instance in *One* which has *No Appearance of Truth*. But because our Author has so *courteously discover'd* to us, the *Ground* of that *dreadfull mistake*, That *Christ will save some whom his Gospel condemnes*; and as you know, *One good Turn deserves another*, that we may not be behind hand in *returns of Civility*, I look upon my self engaged in all the *bonds of honesty and Ingenuity*, to shew him the *Ground of his gross Mistake*; That *Christ is Originally the Name of an Office*. The Man had seen or read somewhere, an Hebrew word חַוִּיט which is something more a kin, to חֵמֶץ , than *Chalk* is to *Cheese*, or *Milk* to *Mustard*; and because that word signifies *Unctio*, an *Anoynting*, and so perhaps at two or three removes, an *Office*, the *Good-man* dream't, that *Messiah* must needs be of the same import; *Quod misere volumus, id facile credimus*; and this might possibly *Trepan* him into that *critical Solécisme*; yet if I have not hit the *Nail on the head*, he has the liberty to assign the *True ground of his Mistake*, and in the mean time I shall live as well as I doe.

But having given us such a *Notable Specimen* of his *Charity*, he is as willing to improve this *grateful Occasion* to Bless us with his *Admirable Divinity*, and to *Illuminate* our *Understandings* (as *Dionysius* the supposed *Arcopagite* exprestes it) with a *Beam of Darknes*.

Two things he is resolved we shall be his *Debtors* for. First, to inform us of the *precise time* of *Christs Anoynting to his Offices*. Secondly, of the *Nature of the Offices themselves*.

(1) For

(1) For the *Time*, he tells us, "Jesus received the Divine *Unction* at his Baptism, when the Spirit of God descended on him like a Dove. Well, seeing 'twas no sooner, I am glad it was no later; and if it will not be allow'd from his *Birth*, and *Incarnation*, it's some Comfort that it was before his *Death*, or *Crucifixion*. But in good earnest, was not Jesus *The Christ* before then? I see, *All wise men are not of one mind*. For those three of the *East*, *Matth. 2. 2.* came to seek and worship, *One Born King of the Jews*. And the Angels preach't other Doctrine to the plain Shepherds, *Luke 2. 11.* *Unto you is Born this day, in the City of David, a Saviour, which is Christ, the Lord*; and *v. 46.* at Twelve years of Age we find him engaged in his *Fathers business*; and we are loth to censure, that he ran before he was sent, or acted before he had a Call, or executed his work before he had a Commission, because we cannot tell (as times goe) what ill use some might make on't. But now, to give some *Appearance of Truth* (though never so little) to this *Errour*, we are turn'd over to *Acts 10. 38.* *How God Anoynted Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost and with Power*; which proves indeed that he was *Anoynted*, and that *with the Holy Ghost*, but not the *Time* when he was Anoynted, onely we are Assured, that after the Baptism of John it was openly *Preach'd*, and *Published*, *v. 37.* I have met with some of your *systematical Divines*, that would have scorn'd to talk so crudely and loosely of these matters; and they tell us, 1. That Christ was Anoynted by the Holy Ghost with an *All-fulness* of *Gifts* and *Graces* from his *Incarnation*, and that there was no Moment, wherein Christ was, and yet

was not anoynted with the Oyl of gladness above his fellowes. 2. That he was declaratively Anoynted at his Baptism, when the Spirit descended on him like a Dove; And therefore they can grant, that Christ was then Anoynted; according to that known Rule, *Multa tunc fieri dicuntur, quando facta esse manifestantur*: Thus the Resurrection of Christ, is said to be a fulfilling of the Psalmist, *Thou art my Son this day have I begotten thee*, Act. 13. 33. when yet the same Apostle understood well his own meaning, that Christ was then Declared to be the Son of God with power by the Resurrection from the dead, Rom. 1. 3, 4. But because our Authors Mistake herein, seems to be more speculative and notional, to carry a more innocent Aspect with it, than some others of his, which like blazing Comets, dart their malignant Influences upon the very Vitals and Essentials of Christianity, it may plead for a more gentle Treatment; and accordingly I shall dismiss it without more severe Animadversions than what it carries along with it.

(2) He proceeds in the next place to inform us in the true Nature of Christs Offices, and that first in General, p. 5. "His Consecration to the Mediatorial Function, Virtually contained all those Offices of the Prophet, Priest, and King, which are not properly distinct Offices in Christ, but the several parts and different Administrations of his Mediatorial Kingdom. I shall take little notice, what Poyson may lurk under that fair word [Virtually] it sounds somewhat oddely, that Christ should be Actually consecrated to a Mediatorial Function, and yet his Offices reside in him onely Virtually; a Function in Act, without an Office in Act;

Alt, is just like an Office in *Alt* without a Function; I know no difference, nor they that are wiser than I: Christs Offices it seems lay dormant in his Function, till time should serve for them to emerge into *Alt*; They were in *Abejance*, that is, when he should ascend to Heaven, he should then become a Priest; We know very well in what Shop this Tool was forged. Nor shall I stay upon that Expression wherein he so much delights, of Christs Mediatorry Kingdom, as if all the Offices of Christ were to be reduced to that of the Regal Power; that which he plainly speaks out is, That the Offices of King, Priest and Prophet, are not properly distinct Offices in Christ. It has been the Interest and therefore the unwearied endeavour of the Socinians to confound the Offices of Christ, which else they were well aware would confound their Heterodoxies; so Volkelius, lib. 3. de verâ Relig. cap. 37. de Sacerdotio Christi, Jam ut de Pontificio Christi munere explicemus, primo loco animadvertendum est, illud ab ejusdem officio Regio, si in rem ipsam mentem intendas non multum differre. Now that we may speak of the Priestly Office of Christ, we must in the first place observe, that it differs not much from his Kingly Office, if we narrowly attend the Nature of the Thing: and his fellow Crellius to the same purpose, Duo ista Munera, Regium nempe & Pontificium, in sacris Literis apertè a se invicem disjuncta, & ut in Scholis loquuntur, contradistincta, nusquam cernas, sed potius alterum in altero quodammodo comprehensum videas. Those two Offices, viz. the Kingly and the Sacerdotal, you shall never observe in the Scriptures to be separated, or (as the School-men speak) contradistinguished, but rather the one included

cluded after a sort in the other: And our Authors Notion is the very *Pallas* hammer'd out of *their Brains*; the Fallshood whereof we shall endeavour to lay open in a few words. And, 1. *The Names* which expresse the Offices of Christ, signifie things properly distinct amongst men, and yet these very Names, by which God knew we understand properly distinct Offices, was he pleas'd to Use to expresse the Offices of Christ by: They were not *Names* or *Terms* coyned by the Holy Ghost, and then a *signification stamp* upon them by *Divine Authority*, but they were first used in common speech, and past currant in the world; never any question'd but a *Priest*, a *Prophet*, a *King*, were distinct Officers, and it were more than strange the Spirit of God should translate the words to signifie Religious matters, and never give us the least intimation that the Significations of the words were changed. 2. They were Properly distinct Persons who Typified our Lord Jesus Christ in his Offices: *Aaron* was onely a Priest, had a *Priesthood* in him distinct from the *Kingly* and *Prophetical Office*; and it were really an astonishing thing, that *Aaron* should be a real proper High-priest, and bear that Office distinct from all others, to typifie him, who had the Office but in an improper, and that a *confused manner in himself*; Nay those Persons in whom two of these Offices did meet, yet kept the Offices in them distinct; *Melchizedek* acted otherwise when he *enacted Laws* at *Salem*, than he did when he stood *besides the Altar*; though both those Offices center'd in his Person, yet they remained really and truly distinct; 3. *The special Acts* of all these Offices are properly distinct in Christ. As the
Kings

Kings Crown, is really another thing from the *Bishops Mitre*, the *Scepter* really distinct from the *Censor*; so are *Teaching*, *Governing*, *Sacrificing*, Properly distinct things. As I cannot imagine how to drag, *foretelling things to come*, into the *Kingly Office*; nor *conquering of Enemies*, and *trampling them under his feet*, to the *Prophetical Office*: so neither how to force *offering up a Sacrifice to God upon an Altar*, to be an Act of either of the other two offices. 4. The *Objects* of these Offices are distinct: For as the *Kingly* and *Prophetical*, have *Men* for their *Objects*; *Men* are to be *governed* and *instructed*; so the *Sacerdotal* hath *God* for its *Object*. *Sacrifices* are for *Men*, but *unto God*. *Heb.* 5. 1. *For every High-Priest taken from amongst men, is ordained for men, in things pertaining to God, that he may offer both Gifts and Sacrifices for sins.* And we may admire the wisdom of God in ordering matters with *such exactness*, in every *punctilio*, that our Lord Jesus should so *exactly* and *closely* answer this description, that no room for cavil might be left, nor any creep-hole for a witty evasion: He was taken from amongst men, ordained for men, in things pertaining to God, he offered Gifts and Sacrifices, and for sins too: And yet in all this we deny not, but that the offices of Christ however really distinct, yet do all meet together in one Person; *Moses* his *Prophetical Office* was really distinct from his *Regal Power*, and yet both met in *Moses* his Person; and secondly we own, that all these did meet in their *general and common end*, the salvation of all Believers, yet there are *next and special ends* very distinct; *enlightning the mind*, *subduing the will*, and *reconciling us to God*, do really differ in them.

them.

themselves; and thirdly, we grant that it was the same God, who by one and the same Call invested our Lord Jesus Christ in all his Offices, and as there was no moment wherein he was *Jesus*, and not the *Christ*, A *Saviour*, and yet *not* authorized to be so; so we conceive, that there was no moment in which he was a *half*, or *two thirds* of a *Christ*, and not a *whole Christ*; his Offices being conferred upon him at the same time. *Hebr. 5. 4, 5. No man taketh this Honour to himself but he that is called of God, as was Aaron.*

Thus have I considered our Authors *general Account* of Christs Offices; and proceed now to what he informs us, concerning them in *particular*. And first let us see what work he will make with Christs *Prophetical Office*. "His preaching the Gospel, (which we commonly call his *Prophetical Office*)" was the Exercise of his *Regal Power*, in publishing his *Laws*. Which we commonly call? Yes indeed the *vulgar* and *common Herd of Divines*, that are not emerged from under *Systems*, and the *prejudices* they have contracted from *gross Bodies of Divinity*, may be allowed to talk in the *old Dialect*; but the *common trite road* is much below the *galantry* of a *rational Divine*, who is manumitted from that *drudgery*; and therefore let the *Volge* call *Preaching* an Act of the *Prophetical Office*, it is now determined, and concluded for ever, that henceforward it be an *act* of the *Kingly Office*: But stay; perhaps our Author wrongs this *Vulgar Tribe*: I confess I am not sure but some of them may have spoken *Non-sence*, in one place or another; but I am sure I have not read this *Non-sence* in any of their works, That *Preaching the Gospel*, is called the

the *Prophetical Office*. They do indeed call it the *Exercise* of that Office, or an *Act* of that Office, but should they call it an *Office*, they would *miscall* it miserably; but if *Preaching the Gospel*, be onely commonly and not truly called (*an Act of*) his *Prophetical Office*; what may we then call it *safely* for the future, and *escape a chiding*? Why you may *securely venture* to call it the *Exercise of his Regal Power*. In good Time! but how long shall this Protection be in force? Just till you come to pag. 18. For there *Preaching the Gospel* is grown to be an Employment belonging to the *Prophetical Office* again; *he came to be our Prophet and our Guide, to teach us by his Precepts and his Life*. But his proof is most admirable: 1. Because, *the Gospel is called the Kingdome of Heaven*: Nay, it's often called the Kingdom of Heaven, which our Author thinks hugely considerable; but if it were call'd so but *once*, it's enough to command our Faith to what it asserts; but the *strength of the consequence* is that I most am at a loss for. *The Gospel is called the Kingdom of Heaven*, Ergo, *Preaching the Gospel belongs to Christs Kingly Office*. That *the state of the Gospel, or the Church is called the Kingdom of Heaven, or a Heavenly kingdome*, is out of Question; That Christ is the *Sovereign Lord and Ruler thereof*, that his *Precepts* are the *Laws* whereby he governs it, is as little questioned; but that there is no proper distinct Employment for a Prophet in this *state or Kingdome*, is flatly denied. Christ was not onely a King to make Laws, but a Prophet to declare, promulgate, and reveal those Laws. Nay, there is other work for Christ to doe besides making of Laws or promulgating of them; there are many
choyse

choyse discoveries of Gods Grace and favour to Sinners, to be revealed; *Reconciliation* and *Attainment* through the Sacrifice of Christ, were to be made, and to be made known; and with what Engines he will hook these into the *Regal Office*, I cannot Prophesie. The Doctrine of the Gospel may be considered, 1. As a *Revelation* or *discovery*, and this is the work of Christ as a *Teacher* or *Prophet*, the great *Prætor*, or publick Officer of Heaven, who having been in the Bosome of the Father from Eternity, came from thence to reveal Gods Will to us, *Joh. 1. 18.* 2. It may be considered as powerfully yet sweetly prevailing over, and subduing of our Hearts to that revealed Truth, and this indeed is the work of Christ as a *King*; but this is a Notion for which our Author will give me little thanks; for not being willing to allow any more power to Christ, than that of the *Evidence of Truth*; and yet seeing a Necessity to assign some Employment or other to Christ as a *King*, he thought it the safest course, to Allott it this Task rather than none at all, and to make the *Regal* go shares with the *Prophetical* office, rather than be quite cashiered, and shut out of Doors. His next Proof is from *John 18. 37.* where (as our Author tells us) Christ tells *Pilate*, that he was born to be a *King*, and the principal Exercise of his Kingly power in this World, consists in bearing witness to the Truth. But they must have other Bibles than we have, or however be well skill'd in the New Device of *varia Lektionen*, that can see any such matter there: Christ asserts himself to be a King, he was so, he was born so, but that he was born to be a King, he tells not *Pilate*; all the strength of his Argument lyes in a little obvious piece of Knavery, joyning

joyning
last w
ly d
Pilate
princ
ing w
came
which
Fathe
sus C
Trut
Fath
fions
has
wher
and
fisher
that
by f
very
thou
ther
Lore
into
the
nity
a w
flau
tion
Pro
Dev
Anc
upo
"R

joyning the first words of the latter sentence, to the
 last words of the former sentence, which are clearly
 distinguished by a full Period. Nor does he tell
 Pilate or us, that the exercise, much less, that the
 principal exercise, of his Kingly Power lay in bear-
 ing witness to the Truth, but that he was born and
 came into the world to bear witness to the Truth;
 which great Truth was, the Promises made to the
 Fathers, of sending the Messiah; Rom. 15. 8. Je-
 sus Christ a Minister of the Circumcision for the
 Truth of God, to confirm the Promises made to the
 Fathers. And indeed, according to those apprehen-
 sions all Mankind have of Things, Witness-bearing
 has nothing in it peculiar to the Royal Power; but
 when he raised the Dead, rebuked winds, and waves,
 and Devils, fed Multitudes with a few loaves and
 fishes, these look like Acts of Regality; so like,
 that the People were ready to come and take him
 by force to make him a King, Joh. 6. 15. upon that
 very occasion. And this he did even in This world,
 though our Author would fain reserve that for Ano-
 ther. The short of the Business lyes here; Our
 Lord Jesus Christ, by his Resurrection, Ascension
 into Heaven, and sitting down at the right hand of
 the Majesty on high, is visibly exalted to more Dig-
 nity and Honour, he exercises his Regal power in
 a way more glorious, and agreeable to his exalted
 state; yet was he truly a King from his Incarna-
 tion, and all along in this world, and gave such
 Proofs of his Royal greatness and Power, that the
 Devils had not Impudence enough to out-face them.
 And now to conclude all with this excellent Gloss
 upon the whole matter. "It was an Act of his
 "Regal Power to conquer Error and Ignorance, to
 "destroy

"destroy the Kingdom of Darknes, by the Bright-
 "ness of his Appearing; to erect his Throne in the
 "Hearts and Consciences of Men. These *Meta-*
phors of conquering, destroying, erecting a Throne,
 came in as *luckily* as the heart of man could wish, to
 prove a *Royal Power*; for what man will now be
 so *refractory* but he will *confess*; and so *senseless*
 and *stupid* but he may *smell a Kingdom in the wind*,
 when he hears such language? but now if you *strip*
 these *Metaphors* to their *bare skins*, and *uncase*
them of all our Authors *Bombast and Fustian*, they
 shrink into a mere *declaration of Truth*, leaving
 the matter to the *umpirage* of an *habitually prej-*
udiced and prepossessed Will; and some think, here's
 no great *Kingship* in all this; for all this is done by
 the *Power and evidence of Truth*; which argues a
Prophet teaching, an Oratour pleading, or a Dispu-
tant arguing; but little of a *King commanding, con-*
quering, and subduing the heart to himself, and there
erecting a Throne, in opposition to all the force that
Satan and Hell can make against him: We do free-
 ly own, that to conquer and destroy the *Kingdom of*
Darknes, to erect a Throne in the Hearts of Men,
 are proper *Acts* of Christs *Kingly Office*; but then
 there goes a little more to the business than the *bare*
Evidence of Truth; the *Arm of a King* must be
 revealed, as well as the *Mouth of a Prophet* opened;
 a *Power* to deal with the *enslaved and obstinate Will*,
 as well as a *Light* to shine into the *darkened under-*
standing; which *Light* yet requires something of
 the *Kingly energie*, to render it *savingly enlightning*
 to the *mind and understanding*. And now our Au-
 thor has made the *kingly Office* to swallow up the
Prophetical, have but patience till he has made it

eat

eat up the *Priestly Office* too, and then the day is his own for ever.

Secondly, He comes to Attack the *Sacerdotal Office* of Christ. *He was* (saith he) *a Kingly Priest*. Well! so he was, and so he might be, and yet though both the *Offices* center'd in his Person, they might be formally distinct in their *Acts*, *special Ends*, and *proper Objects*; Nay, we will allow, that All his *Offices* conspiring in the same *general Ends*, their *Acts* might have *mutual respect*, and give *reciprocal assistance* each to other. And he could not have chosen a fitter Instance than that of *Melchizedek*, who being *King of Salem*, and *Priest of the most high God*, *Heb. 7.* yet would it savour of too gross Absurdity to say, that when he offered sacrifice, or blessed *Abraham*, he appeared in the *Quality* of a *King*, or when he enacted *Civil Laws*, he bore the *Character* of a *Priest*; but our Authors Proofs are as Pertinent as his Doctrine True: His Doctrine is, *When he offered himself a Sacrifice for sin, he acted like a King*, p. 6. Really one would think he acted as like a *Priest* as we could reasonably desire. For, 1. Here is a *Sacerdotal Act*: he offer'd. 2. A *Sacrifice*: Himself. And, 3. This was for sin. And what of a *King* do we spell out of all this? The truth is, there's nothing in all this, but a pitifull *Sacrian Juggle*, who having resolved not to own Christ as a true and proper *Priest* at all, and yet not daring to deny *express phrases of Scripture*, found out this Expedient, to own the thing in words, and then to shuffle it off with a Metaphor. The Proof of his Doctrine is of the same Leaven; *Joh. 10. 18.* *No man took his Life from him; he had power to lay it down, and he had power to take it up again.* Our

C

Author

Author had told us, p. 2. of a crafty sort of Men in the World, that consider nothing but the sound of words, and from thence form such uncounted Ideas of Religion as are fitted to the meanness of their understanding; and will tell us further, p. 102. of some, who Interpret Scripture by the Sound and Clink of Words and Phrases. And it seems the Contraption of this vanity, infected his own intellectuals; he found the word Power in the Text, and he runs away with a full crye, *Ευωχη. Ιουδα!* but the Mischief on't is, it's not *Ιουδα*; but *Ιουδα*; not a Physical, but a Moral Power that Christ owns there; a Power which is common to all his Offices, he had Power, or Commission to Preach; Power or Authority to Rule and govern; Power or warrant from his Father to lay down his Life, for the great End that was agreed on between them both, — For he explains himself in the same Verse; Not, *this Strength*, but *This Commandment I received from my Father*. Nor yet is it denyed, that Christ made use of his Kingly might in laying down his Life, and taking it up again, all we plead for is, that the Offices and their peculiar Acts may not be jumbled and confounded together.

Thirdly, Having dispatch'd out of the way the two great Eye-sores of the Prophetical, and Priestly Office; he thought it not amiss to send the third after them: And that to which we commonly appropriate the Name of Regal Power (that Authority he is vested with to govern his Church, to send his Spirit, to forgive sins, to dispense grace, and supernatural assistances, to answer Prayers, and raise the dead, and judge the World,) All this is the reward of his Death and Sufferings. I confess I wonderd

der'd why he should make the *Regal Office* of Christ so over-top all the rest; but I soon satisfied my self from *Volkstius*, lib. 3. de *verâ Relig.* p. 41. *Maximè Regibus id habebatur honoris, ut Christi, sive autem appellarentur, ita ut cum Christum dici audis, Regem imprimis dici intelligas.* Kings had chiefly that Honour, that they should be called *Christs*, or *Anointed ones*, so that when you hear the *Name Christ* mention'd, you must understand, that a *King* is especially intended. This I confess quieted me; but why our Author should be so zealous, to set up a King of his own making, and then all o'th sudden to pluck him down again, to *enthronè* and *de-thronè* at pleasure, is at present to me *unaccountable*; for I observe, he has removed these great Things from his *Kingly Office*, and placed them upon another Foundation, viz. the reward of his death and sufferings. Now take away *Preaching the Gospel*, from his *Prophetical Office*; subtract offering himself a *Sacrifice*, from his *Sacerdotal Office*; and then *Governing the Church*, raising the Dead, and judging the World, &c. from his *Regal Office*; and when you have done, compute the clear Remainder, and I suppose at the foot of the Account, you will have three great Cyphers, without one poor figure to give them the least signification or value. I know he will say; He does but onely place them upon other Bottomes, and so long as we find them, what's matter where they are found. But then (say I) they will have but a *præcarious station* in any other place, and he that removes them from their proper and true grounds, can with a wet finger jostle them from that false Basis whereon, out of meer good Nature, he had for a season set them,

But to come closer home to our Author: There are two small faults I charge this Discourse with; *Confusion* and *Falshood*: First, Here's a great deal of *Confusion*; As your old dull Philosophers use to tell us, that Cold did congregare *Heterogenea*, *Unite things that were of differing Names and Natures*; so has our Author glazed over his discourse with Ice, which has so *united things of various Natures*, that its hard to find *sure footing* in his *Expressions*: Christ pardons sin upon one Account, governs his Church, and raises the Dead upon another: The former he does by his *Sacrifice*, the other by his *almighty power*. And yet some of these things, in one respect, belong to one Office of Christ, and some of them to another: he purchases Grace as a Priest, he dispenses and gives forth that Grace as a King; he offers *Sacrifice* for sin as our *High-priest*; yet he applies the pardon of sin to us, as a King: But, Secondly, I find as much *Falshood* as *Confusion* in these *Expressions*; and that, 1. In denying that these are truly appropriated to Christs *kingly Office*. For if *Governing the Church, raising the Dead, Judging the World*, do not speak a king, never talk more of a *Kingly Office* in Christ, but make that *Metaphorical too*, as you make the rest, and so the Tree is cut up by the roots. 2. In that these are assigned only as the *Reward of his Death and Sufferings*. For we find Christ invested with an Authority to execute, and actually executing these Powers before his Death, saving in one or two particulars, where the *Nature of the Thing* did exclude the perfect and compleat exercise of them at that time. It may be worth the while to run over the particulars, (1) For governing the Church; he gave *Laws* to it,

set

set up new Institutions of Worship for it; Baptism and the Lords Supper, to continue to the end of the World; sent out his Apostles to preach the Gospel, and we have good and sufficient warrant for it, under our Authors own hand, just on the other side of the Leaf, That his preaching the Gospel, was the exercise of his Regal Power and Authority in publishing his Laws.

(2) For sending his Spirit, that is, in an extraordinary way pouring out the gifts of Miracles; 'tis true, the full and abundant effusion of these Gifts was reserved for the day, when the Son of Man should be glorified: Yet it is clear beyond Contradiction, that Christ had the Power, and delegated the Power too before his death; The Gift of speaking with Tongues there was no need of, and Christ never used to bestow extraordinary Gifts without an extraordinary and pressing Reason; The Apostles were sent to their own Countrey-men, and could dispatch their Errand, and deliver their Message in their Vernacular and Mother-tongue, Math. 10. 5. Goe ye not into the way of the Gentiles, and into any of the Cities of the Samaritans enter ye not; but goe rather to the lost Sheep of the house of Israel: But as to other miraculous Operations of the Holy Spirit, he had Authority to make it over to others, v. 8. Heal the sick, cleanse the Lepers, raise the Dead, cast out Devils; Nay the Seventy Disciples had an extraordinary power in their Commission, as it appears, Luke 10. 17. And the Seventy returned again with joy, saying, Even the Devils are subject to us through thy Name. That is, We produced thy warrant and authority, and the very Devils could not resist it.

(3) As to forgiveness of sins, there needs no other proof that Christ had the power, than that he exer-

tis'd it. *Matth. 9. 2.* Son be of good cheer thy sins
 be forgiven thee. I know there are some who will
 allow Christ a Power to forgive sins, even here on
 Earth; but then it's such an odde kind of Forgiveness
 as never was heard of; *Folk. lib. 3. de verâ
 Relig. cap. 21.* *Non diffitemur quidem cum (viz.
 Christum) cum in terris degerit, diviniſſimâ potentiâ
 prædictum fuiſſe, quam ipſe peccatorum in terrâ con-
 donandorum, id eſt, terrena ab hominibus ſupplicia,
 propulſandi poteſtatem appellat.* We deny not that
 Christ even when he was upon Earth, had a most
 divine power, which he calls a Power to forgive sins,
 that is, to drive away from men temporal and bo-
 dily punishments. A very liberal concession truly;
 to cure a Fever or an Ague, must be pardon of sin,
 when these mens Necessities require it should be so.
 (4) That Christ did dispense Grace and supernatu-
 ral assistance, at any time, we are glad to hear
 owned, and as sorry that they vanish again into
 smoke, and nothing, when our Author is out of the
 good Mood; but let them signify what he will, for
 once, he dispensed them before his death, he con-
 quered Error and Ignorance, destroy'd the King-
 dom of darkness by the brightness of his Appearing,
 erected a Throne in the Hearts and Conſciences of
 men, by the power and evidence of Truth. And I
 suppose he will allow Christ to do no more now he
 is risen from the dead. (5) That Christ rais'd the
 Dead, needs no other Confirmation, than to call
 over the Instances of Lazarus, the Widows Son of
 Naim, the daughter of Jairus; but whether he did
 it with, or without Authority, I list not to dispute
 till I hear the Gentleman endeavour to disprove it.
 (6) That he answer'd Prayers will need no proof;
 I think

I think it would puzzle the most forward Caviller to instance in *one Case*, where-ever he denyed Mercy to any, that with Faith or Importunity craved it for themselves or others: (7) That the power to judge the World, was committed to him, we have his own words, *Joh. 5. 27. The Father hath given him authority to execute judgement, because he is the Son of Man.* And the ground of this Power entrusted with him, is not assigned because he had merited it by his death and sufferings, but because he was the *Son of Man*. And though it be true, that the General Judgement be yet to come, yet Christ was furnished with ample Power to execute it, whenever it should come. Say the same of his bestowing immortal Life on all his Disciples: Now concerning all these, it is acknowledged once for all, that though he had the Original and Radical Power, the plenary Commission to put in Execution all these matters, during the state of his Humiliation, and in some pregnant particulars did accordingly exert and put forth that Authority, yet the way and manner, the degree and measure of his Acting therein, was in much wisdom suited to that dispensation wherein he was to appear in the form of a Servant; The more illustrious, august, and solemn exercising thereof being reserved for the state of Exaltation, when he should appear like himself, cast off the Cloud which had eclipsed the rays of his Deity, and sit down on the right hand of the Majesty on high.

But 3^{ly}. I must repeat my charge of Falshood against his Doctrine, in that he says, *All this is called his Intercession*, p. 6. That Government of the Church, Raising the Dead, Judging the world, &c.

should be called Christs *Intercession*, looks as like Non-sence, as ever I saw any thing in my life. For *Intercession* has God for its Object; as *Intercessor* he deals with his Father, though on the behalf of Men, 1 *Joh.* 2. 1. *We have an Advocate with the Father, and he is the propitiation for our sins.* I should wonder to hear, that an *Advocates Office* should be to plead with his *Clyent*, and not with and before the *Judge*, on the behalf of his *Clyent*: but because *Intercession* is the other great *Branch* of the *Sacerdotal Office*, and some are deeply concerned, that he should not offer up a *Proper sacrifice* to God, they judge it Reason, that one part of the same *Office* should not fare better than the other: The *High-Priest* under the *Law*, when he had offered *Sacrifice* upon the *Altar*, upon the *Feast* of *Expiation*, he goes into the *Holy place*, with the blood, carrying on his *Breast* and on his *shoulders* the *Names* of the *twelve Tribes*, to signify that he went in to intercede with God for the whole Church; what He did typically, Christ has done really, *Hebr.* 9. 12. for when he had obtained eternal *Redemption* for us by his blood, he goes to *Heaven*, there to *Appear* before his *Father* and our *Father*, his *God*, and our *God*, on our behalf, and this is indeed called his *Intercession*; the benefits we have thereby, comprize some or all of those things before mention'd; but I think it's reasonable to distinguish between a thing and its proper effects and fruits: but these are nothing but the *Socinian Coleworts*, twenty times doyled till they are rank poyson; So *Volkel.* lib. 3. *de verâ Relig.* p. 148. *Primo illud occurrit, quod seipsum pro nobis in Cælo offert, vel quod idem re ipsa est, pro nobis coram Deo astat, seu apparet; ut* que

que in
nam r
tificat
merat
perfect
that C
all on
before
kingd
Office
really
Earth
mans
the L
the c
but is
Conf
quote
ever
borro
But
prehe
nem,
dam
loque
rûs f
Rati
it fol
by
else
Chr
earn
finel
Aut

que interpellat, quæ omnia verba ad Christi Regnum translata sunt, per similitudinem ab illorum Pontificum Officio ductam, quod erat omnia modò enumerata in terrestri illo Sanctuario propriè verèque perficere. This we take notice of in the first place, that Christ offers himself for us in Heaven, which is all one, stands, or appears, and intercedes for us before God; all which words are applyed to the kingdom of Christ, by a Metaphor taken from the Office of those High-priests, which was properly and really to perform the things fore-mentioned in that Earthly Sanctuary. So that now according to this mans Sentiments, the typical, umbratile Priests under the Law, did that really and properly, which Christ the only True and proper High-priest performs but in a shadow. And I do the more wonder at the Confidence of the Man, who could to this purpose quote *Hebr. 7.* which Chapter, plainly sets Christ's ever living to make Intercession for us, upon this bottom, that he hath an *unchangeable Priesthood.* But p. 149. he comes close up to our Authors apprehensions. Itaque consequens est, Interpellationem, nequaquam propriè, sed per translationem quandam Christo tribui, nihilque reverà aliud ejusmodi loquendi formis significari, quam Christum divinitus sibi concessâ potentia, omnia quæ ad salutis nostræ Rationem pertinent, summo studio perficere. Hence it follows that Intercession is not at all properly, but by Allusion ascribed to Christ; and that nothing else is signified by those forms of speech, but that Christ by a Power granted him from God, doth very earnestly perform all things that belong to the Business of our Salvation. And how sweetly does our Author syncretise with him; *Government of the Church,*

Church, sending the Spirit, are called his Intercession: And his Reason is as pretty as his Doctrine: — because like the Intercession of the High priest under the Law, it's founded on his Expiation and Sacrifice. The strength of this Argument, (if it has any) will be easily seen; If Christs Intercession be founded on his Expiation, then his Governing the Church, is called his Intercession; But the former is as true as what's most so, Ergo, the latter is True also: The Assumption is but a meer Presumption, one part of Christ's Priesthood is not founded upon another, but both are equally founded in his Union, and that Authority which he received from his Father; but it's the Consequence of the former Proposition, which I would see a little more clear; for methinks they hang untowardly together. Suppose Christs Intercession were founded upon his Sacrifice; for what I can discover, his governing the Church, sending his Spirit, raising the dead, may be Acts of his Kingly Power, as they have always been.

Let this whole matter be layd even with the type: *Aaron did not only offer Sacrifice to God upon his Altar, but he went into the most holy place to make intercession for the people; Was his Intercession founded on his Oblation? or both his Power to Offer and Intercede, grounded upon his Office, that he was High-priest? Intercession then signifies not the Administration of a Mediator Kingdom, which has Men for its immediate and proper Object, but the Administration of an everlasting Priesthood, which has God for its Object, though managed on the behalf of Men; so it has signified this sixteen hundred years, and so it is like to doe,*
till

till we see stronger Engines to unfix the Notion of it. Hitherto of the Nature of Christs Offices, which he sayes is a true Account of his Mediatory Kingdome; but, I say, it's the most false, absurd, and Idle account that ever was given by any but our Author and his partizans of the Socinian misbelief, and is neither reconcileable with the Truth, nor with it self, one instance whereof we have in this last Paragraph. That (sayes he) to which we commonly appropriate the Name of Regal power, is his Intercession: Commonly indeed, but not truly so called; and yet in the close, he tells you, that Intercession signifies the Administration of a Kingdom, which how it should doe, and not pertain to his kingly Office, I cannot make out.

And now from the Nature of Christs Kingdome, he proceeds to the method of erecting it. 1. He conquers the minds of men by the power of his Word and Spirit, and reduces them to subjection to God. 2. Then he pardons their sin: 3. He raiseth them to Immortal Life: 4. This is done by the Expiation of his Sacrifice, and that Power and Authority that is founded on it. Of which supposed Order and Method of Christs procedure, because abundant occasion will be offered for its Consideration in the ensuing Discourse, I shall supersede any further Disquisition at present.

I hope the Reader does not forget whereabouts he is, and what our Authors operose Endeavours have design'd; it is to prove, That Christ is Originally the Name of an Office, and fearing that none would bestow the pains to confute him, he is willing to save the world that Labour, and confute himself. And this is the Interpretation of the Name Christ,

Christ,

Christ, which signifies a mediatory King, immediately appointed by God to that Office, p. 7. Be therefore Reported to the Judgements of all to determine, Whether a Mediatory King, be a Person or a Thing: an Office, or an Officer? So large a Dose of Milk had he given us, and now has kicked it all fairly down again with his foot: Indeed we had complained before that he favour'd us not with one Text of Scripture to establish his Notion; But 'twas not out of Penury, but Plenty, and that it seems made him Poor, For thus (says he) the Name Christ signifies in those places of Scripture where Jesus is said to be the Christ, i. e. that Messiah whom God promis'd to send. So that all the further trouble the Reader is like to have from me in this matter, is to advise with himself, Whether, He, the Messiah whom God promised to send, be the one or the other; i. e. Whether God promised an Office, which like the Popish Accidents of Bread and Wine should hang in the Air without their proper Subjects, or Mahomets Tombs; or else a real person even Jesus the Mediator between God and Man, furnished with those Offices of Prophet, Priest, and King, to save us in turning away every one of us from our Iniquities.

Secondly, Though Christ is Originally the Name of an Office, yet it is used in Scripture to signify the Person who is invested with this Office. It would tempt a man to enquire, what that original use of the word is, which is opposed to the Scripture use. In some Original or other it's the Name of an Office; and that can be no other but the Originals of Socinus, Valartius, Crellius, and other of the same bran; however we are infinitely his Debtors for the Concession,

cession, that the *Scripture Use* of the word is wheel'd about to our side; though just now, The places were so many and so obdious that he needed not name them, for the other use of the word. But I see it's not wisdom to be too hasty to own a kindness before we be sure on't, for no man more reall when he offers an Injury, nor more complemental in his Courtesies; for he's just now standing upon a Tack. Before his Designation to this Office was publicly owned, he was onely call'd Jesus, the Name given him by the Angel, before he was born, yet when by his Resurrection from the Dead he was declared with power to be the Son, and the Christ of God, Christ became his Proper Name, as Jesus was before. It may create a suspicion in some jealous heads, that our Author does insinuate Jesus to become the Son of God, as he became the Christ of God; which latter bears date in our Authors Chronology, from After the Resurrection, but Suspicions ought to prejudice no man. To his confident Assertion, I answer: *show me where it is said*

1. That this blessed Person of whom we speak, was call'd Christ, without any reference to mens owning or not owning of him; nor could he claim to be owned by men as the Christ of God, unless he had been so, even the Christ, before such claim; he was therefore owned, because he was Antecedently so, and not subsequently call'd Christ because Men had owned him: It were strange indeed that he should hold his Name upon so ticklish a Tenure as that, *Ad voluntatem Populi*.

2. That he was owned to be the Christ of God before his Resurrection from the dead, not so generally and universally, but yet as really and truly; Nay,

Nay, all that owned him to be *Jesai's Saviour* from sin, owned him to be *the Christ Anointed of God*, that he might be a *Saviour*: They that deny'd him to be *the Christ*, deny'd him to be a *Jesús*; for what firm Footing could Faith have to believe him to be a *Saviour*, had he not brought his *Credentials* along with him, that he was *sent of God*, for that End, a *Term* of the same *Imports* with that of *Christ*.

3. The *Christ of God* was as truly his *Proper Name*, as *Jesús*: These with many others, denoting still the *same Person*, though under *divers Considerations*: *Jesús* was his *Name*, expressing the *General end* for which he came into the World: *Immanuel* was his *Name*, denoting the *Union of God and Man*, in *one* and the *same Person*: *Mediator* was his *Name*, as signifying the two Parties between whom he was to stand, and whom he was to *Reconcile*; and *Christ* was his *Name* too, as intimating the *Authority* he had from his *Father*, to *Accomplish* the *Work of Saving*, which he undertook.

4. The Angels foretelling his *Name* to be *Jesús*, makes not that to have the *Advantage* of the other *Appellations* of *Christ*: Seeing he was made *The Christ*, by the *Father Himself*, and yet we have the *Suffrage* of an *Angel* too, that he was *Born* the *Christ*, *Luke 2. 11. Unto you is Born this day a Saviour, in the City of David, which is Christ the Lord.*

5. As sadly out is our *Author* to say, that in the *Gospels* he is *always* called *Jesús*: Which, whether you take it *Exclusively*, as shutting out the *Name of Christ*, or *Inclusively*, taking in the *Name of Jesús*,

is

is apparently False, and needs nothing but a Common pair of Spectacles for its Confutation: But the stress of all this Pother lying here, that he was not called Christ as by his Proper Name, till after the Resurrection, we shall call over a few of many places in the New Testament to Evince the Contrary, *John 4. 25.* The Woman of *Samaritan* went upon Common Fame, and a generally received Maxim, that he that should acquaint them with the Will of God, was to be called Christ. *I know that Messiah cometh, which is called Christ, and when he is come, he will tell us all things.* And our Saviour would not suffer her to hang in Suspense about the Person, who was so well Satisfied about his Name, and Employment, but presently Answers, *v. 26.* *What speakst thou, am He:* The poor Woman glad at the News, and loth to Rejoyce alone, Proclaims it in the Streets, and speaking in their own known Dialect, says she: *Is not this the Christ?* ver. 29. *John 1. 40.* Andrew findeth his own Brother Simon, and saith unto him, *we have found the Messiah, which is being Interpreted, the Christ.* A Person then there was who under the Title of Christ, was alwayes laid before the Faith and Expectancies of the People of God. And of so great Concernment was this Name, that Peter joyns it with the Son of God, *Matth. 16. 15.* *Whom do ye say that I am?* Simon Peter answered (in the Name of the rest) *Thou art Christ, the Son of the Living God.* I shall not urge the Testimony of the Devils, *Luke 5. 41.* *Thou art Christ, the Son of the Living God:* For he is a Lyar from the Beginning, and would not have owned the Truth, but to Disparage it by his Testimony; yet its somewhat sad, there should be greater

greater Heresies on Earth, than in Hell: Nor shall I insist upon that of the Souldiers, who took it for granted that he was commonly Distinguisht by the Name *Christ*, *Mat. 16. 68. Prophecie unto me, thou Christ, who it is that smote thee.* But Christ's own Testimony must pass, *Matth. 23. 8. 10. Be not ye called Rabbi, for one is your Master even Christ, and all ye are Brethren; neither be ye called Master, for one is your Master, even Christ.* A huge Bussle there has been about this place, and our Authors Evidence had it been Subpoened in, would have struck the Business dead, *One is your Master, even an Office*: And now will you hear a Facetious and Merry Reason, why *He is alwayes called Jesus in the Gospels, which contain the History of his Life and Death, p. 8. Because (forsooth) all this time it was Disputed, whether He were the Christ or not.*

Great Disputes indeed the Devil has raised about the Lord Jesus, some will dare to Dispute it, whether He be very *God* or not, others whether He be the *Christ of God* or not? And not a few, whether he offered himself a *Propitiatory Sacrifice* upon the Cross, to an offended God for sin; so that if Christ must never be owned till all Disputes be ended, we must *Prorogue his Naming*, till the coming of *Elias*: The World was then as 'tis now; which would alwayes be Disputing things in themselves Indisputable, Disputed then his Name was before his Resurrection, and so has been ever since, by *Insidels*; and by those who Believed, neither Disputed before nor after. I have heard of a great Dispute of late amongst Persons of great Learning, about the Reason of an Appearance in Philosophy, when one of the

the Company, wiser it seems than his Neighbours, gravely Counsell'd them, to Examine more narrowly, whether indeed the Thing were so *in Fact or no*; before they did beat their Brains about giving a Reason why it should be so: His Advice was hearkned to, and upon severe Scrutiny, they had been Arguing about a *Non-entity*. Thus it had become our Authors *Excellencie* to have shewn *that it is*, before he came to flie so high, at the *Why it is*? But it seems the Matter was not weighty, whether he were *the Christ* or not; it being determined by our Authors own *Licenser*, that *whatever is Disputable is inconsiderable*.

Thirdly, *Christ signifies the Gospel and Religion of Christ: As Moses signifies the Writings, and Law of Moses, and the Prophets the Writings of the Prophets*. Hold, good Sir, Create your self no further Trouble, we will grant you *more* than you *can Prove*, even as much as you *Demand*, that we may purchase our Peace. And that, in *Common Speech*, *Christ* may signify *his Laws* by much stronger Reasons, than *Moses* can signify *his Laws*: For *Moses* was but a *Servant* in His *Masters House*; but *Christ* a *Son* in, and over his own *House*; *Christ* was the *Law Maker*, *Moses* only an *Instrument* for their *Promulgation*, and *Execution*. But then it must be Remembered withal, 1. That the Name *Moses* signifies *Originally, Properly, and Primarily* the *Person of Moses*, the *very Man Moses*, and only *Obliquely, Secondly, Figuratively*, or (as your great Friend *Vol.* has it) *Analogico, Figuratoque dicendi genere*; the *Doctrine, Writings, Laws of Moses*. 2. That when we meet with a word that has a *Proper*, and an *Improper*; a *First* and a

D Second;

Second; a Plain and a Tropical Signification, we always let that Proper, Plain, and Primary signification take the Wall, and have the Upper hand of the Improper, Tropical, and Second-hand sense; all ways provided, that no Cogent Inexorable Reason taken from the Circumstances of the Place, do Oblige to the Contrary. 3. We must well understand what our Author Claims, and what we Grant: That it's usual, nothing more usual, in Common Speech, than to call any Laws or Religion, by the Name of the first Author: In Common Speech then this holds; for if he will lay the Weight or Strefs of any Disputable Point upon it, that the word is so used in Scripture, we must beg his Pardon, and desire him to hold us Excused, unless he can Prove it by Convincing Arguments; and we lay down this Protestation before-hand, that we shall not take High mounted Confidence, nor Imperious Disputes, nor Hungry jejune Glosses for Apodictick in the Case: The rather, because we are ascertained that the Name Christ does Properly, Primarily, Frequently, nay, Generally express a Person in Office; and if our Author will needs have it signifie, or Office, or Church, or Gospel, or any Living thing else in all the World, merely to evade the force of Truth, or to hedge in any Whimsical Notions of his own; he shall get his Ground by Inches, and force his Way through the main Rocks, for we shall part with nothing that we can Fairly and Honestly keep. But we attend his Evidence, Gal. 6. 23. In Christ Jesus neither Circumcision availeth any thing, nor Uncircumcision, but a new Creature. That is, in the Gospel, and Religion of Christ, nothing is of any Value to Recommend us to the favour of

of God, but a new Nature, a Holy, and Versuous Life, p. 9.

To which Gloss, I oppose two small Inconveniences: First, The Uncertainty. Secondly, The Apparent falshood of it. First, If there were nothing else to Disparage it, its Uncertainty is enough for its merely Precarious, that Christ must signify so here: If any has the Confidence to deny it, though never so faintly, the Cause is utterly blown up; our Negative upon him, puts him to Eternal silence. When our Author is hard pressed at any time, he has one Answer ready Cut and Dried, which serves for every Text in the Scripture, as pag. 201. It is a sufficient Answer to this, to say, they need not signify so. If that will suffice him, which others must be glad to be sufficed with, he's Answer'd: But why not the Common Gloss? In the Account of Jesus Christ, Circumcision, nor Uncircumcision avail nothing, but, &c. And the strongest Probabilities lie on this side: First, The foregoing words, whereof this Verse is rendred as a Reason, do unquestionably speak of a Person, viz. 14. The Cross of our Lord Jesus Christ. And now comes in this Verse as a Reason or Proof thereof: For in Christ Jesus, &c. Did the Apostles Premises speak of one thing, and his Conclusion of another? 2. Here's this lies in the way, that no Cogent Reason can be assigned why we should depart from the Plain, Ordinary, Primary acceptation of the Word Christ, for a Figurative, Improper and Secondary acceptation, but only to humour our Author; for which at present I am not in the Mood. 3. He is miserably short in his Foundation; for after all his pains to prove that Christ signifies

has an Office, a Doctrine, a Church; he must go over with all this again, and prove that *Jesui* signifies a Doctrine, and Jesus a Church, or else he's just in *Strain quo*. For he had told us before, that (though Christ was an Homonymous word, a Name, of Desuetory, Lubricous, and Versatile sound) Jesus was his Proper Name, given him by the Angel before he was Born; and therefore surely that has not been Warped, and Twisted, and Scrned, at that Rate that this other poor Name has been; for as it falls out unhappily. Here's *Jesui* joyned with Christ, and that perswades us almost, that a very Person is intended.

But yet secondly, The apparent Falshood of it sticks more with me than all this, I could easily down with a few Absurdities: For I think, and believe according to the Scripture, That there is something besides a *Virtuous Life* of value to Recommend us to the Favour of God; nay, something more of Value (and I shall not be Hector'd out of it by Blustering words.) 'Tis the Righteousness of Jesus which I mean, and we have the Apostles Warrant for it, *Ephes. 1. 6. He hath made us accepted in the Beloved. If God should enter into Judgment with us according to the Exactest of our Obedience, perhaps we should be willing to accept of Christ's Recommendation to the favour of God, notwithstanding our most virtuous Lives, but secondly, I indite it of Falshood, that he makes a new Creature, and a virtuous Life, equivalent Expressions: For I had thought that a virtuous Life is but the Fruit that Grows on the Tree, but the Tree must be made good, e're the Fruit can be so; A virtuous Life the Streams, that flow from the Spring of the*

the new Creature, and the Fountain must be cleansed ere the Streams will be so. In plain Terms, the vertuous Life is but the Result of a new Heart, the product of a *Reviv'd Nature*; without which Principle of a vertuous Life, and without Christ to Recommend both to God, there is no hope to find favour in his sight.

His second place is, Col. 2. 8. Beware lest any man spoil you through Philosophy and vain Decree, after the Traditions of Men, after the Rudiments of the World, and not after Christ. Where (says he) after Christ is oppos'd to the Traditions of Men, and Rudiments of the World, and therefore must signify, not the Person, but the Religion or Gospel of Christ. Must it? And what necessity of that? I can see none from the Text: But if our Author has impos'd upon himself an absolute and indispensable necessity of being Baptiz'd into *Volkelius*, then indeed it must be so interpreted, no remedy: Lib. 9. c. 10. p. 437, 438. *Divinitatis Nominis, nec Dei nec Christi Natura, sed Divina voluntatis notitia, Deique colendi ratio intelligi potest, atque ideo debet.* By the name Deity, not the Nature of God, nor of Christ, but the knowledge of the Divine Will, and the manner of Worshipping God: May be, and therefore must be understood. The Reader is now satisfi'd why it must be so? It may be so, and therefore necessarily it must be so. *Volkelius* says it must be, and therefore it must. But let us be judg'd by the words following; *Non after Christ, for in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily, ver. 9. Does the fulness, the all fulness of the Godhead dwell bodily in the Doctrine, or in the Person of Christ, ver. 10. And ye are complete in*

him, who is the Head of Principality and Power: Is a Christ's Person that is that Head of Angels, or his Doctrine? and so the Apostle runs at once, with the Doctors to the Cross of Christ; ver. 14. Many will now, to Gratifie these Gentlemen, renounce our Rites, and say, that a Doctrine is the Head of Principality and Power? A Doctrine is rais'd from the Dead? That we are Buried in a Doctrine? That the Hand-writing of Ordinances was Nailed to the Cross of a Doctrine? I confess I would go as far as another for Peace sake; but here I must fairly shake hands and leave my Author, and his Masters to their own ways: But though the words following the Text do frown severely upon them and their Cause, yet they promise themselves much from the foregoing, ver. 6. As you have therefore received Jesus Christ the Lord, so walk ye in him: 11. 12. Obey the Doctrine of Christ, as you have been taught by us. It must be remembred what our Author is endeavouring to prove still, I hope he has not forgot it, and I hope we shall not, viz. That the Name [Christ] signifies the Gospel: Now it is easily granted, that though the Name [Christ] do Immediately signify the Person of Christ; yet Medially it may imply the Doctrine; and yet all this while the Name, or Word Christ stand in its Original posture, and Posture. As the name King does primarily signify the Person of a Supreme Magistrate, and yet that Treason which is committed against the Person of a King, is against his Title, and yet none will say that because Treason against the King is Treason against the Title, that therefore, the name, King, signifies Title. To violate the Commands of the Gospel, reflects upon Christ's Person; and not that

fins

sins, against the one, sins against the other, because
 of that Priviey of Interest, that is betwixt a King
 and his Laws, a Prophet, and his Revelations, a
 Priests, and his Sacrifice; yet it were harsh to say,
 that Prophet, does signifie Revelations; or Priests,
 Sacrifice; or King, signifie Laws: Those things
 may have Relation one to another, one be Inferred
 from another, and not the one signifie the other:
 As, 1 Cor. 7. 12. When ye sin against the Brethren,
 and wound their weak consciences, ye sin against
 Christ: To sin against the Brethren, is by conse-
 quence to sin against Christ. Yet none will say, that
 the Name Christ signifies Brethren. But more
 particularly I answer, 1. That Christ Jesus, the
 Lord, does signifie in the first place a Person; And
 secondly, That consequently it Includes the Pro-
 mises, the Precepts, the Revelations, the Death,
 Sufferings, the Intercession and the whole of Jesus.
 But his main strength lies here: That after, Christ
 is opposed to the Traditions of Men, and the Rudi-
 ments of the World, and therefore must not signifie
 the Person, but the Religion or Gospel of Christ.
 So argues Volk Lib. 3. de verâ Relig. p. 123. *Hi
 mundi Rudimenta, omnem Divinitatis Plenitudi-
 nem in Christo sanctissimâque ejus Disciplinâ, cor-
 poraliter, h. e. reipsa, non arbitrii quadam rati-
 one, ut in Lege, habitantem opponit.* Unto these
 Rudiments of the World, the Apostle opposeth all
 the fulness of the Divinity, which dwelt Bodily,
 (that is, Really, not after a Typical fashion as in the
 Law) in Christ, and his most holy Discipline.
 And yet this crafty Knave had a reach far beyond
 what I hope our Author is guilty of, namely to cut
 in sunder the Nerves and Sinews of this Text as

it asserts the Deity of Christ, and therefore very libelously, he turns Deity into Divinity, *Deum*, into *Divinum*: And that we may see how Eagerly and Zealously he is Concerned for such a signification of Christ, as much as our Author can be for the heart of him. Consult. 3 Lib. de vera Relig. cap. 5. p. 47. *Qua de causa Divini moniti incitamus, ut omnibus aliis Disciplinis Poschabitis, uni Christo adhaeramus, in quo, id est, in cujus Doctrina, omnis Divinitas plenitudo continetur*: For with Reason we are call'd upon by the Counsel of the Scripture, to leave all other Religions, and to cleave to Christ alone, in whom, that is, in whose Doctrine, all the Fullness of the Divinity is contain'd. And so perfect a Mime is our Author of this Volk, that he borrows his very *id ests* of him: But to these things I return. 1. That the opposition lies Visibly in the first place between, *Men*, and *Christ*, secondly between: *Mens Traditions*, and *Christis Institutions*. 2. That the Person of Christ as the only Law-giver of the Church, is directly oppos'd to the Traditions of Men: For as the Popes Laws, if set on foot in England, would not only cross the Laws of the Land, but strike at our Sovereign Lord the King, his Crown and Dignity; so the Traditions of Men, do not only thwart Christ's Institutions, but mainly and chiefly Christ himself, who is the Author of them. 3. From the All fullness of the Deity which dwells in Christ, it's Obvious to an ordinary Capacity to inferre, that there is a Perfection in his Doctrine, a compleatness in his Institutions; that there needs no Supply from Mens Traditions, no Relief from Philosophy, or

Rudi

Rudin
fession
Exce
Perjo
exten
last p
Lea
been
fore
Text
his
Tran
he ha
Arti
1.
idid
it, b
very
last A
the d
ited.
enal
Esse
ever
whic
Squa
be V
huju
2.
him,
that
whe
Eph
100

Rudiments of the World; but if, because the Perfection of his Doctrine may be concluded from the Excellency of his Person, he will conclude that his Person signifies his Doctrine, we must desire to be excused, for no such thing will thence follow. His last place is, *Ephes. 4. 20, 21. But you have not so Learn'd Christ, if so be you have heard him, and been taught by him, as the Truth is in Jesus.* Before our Author can make his best Markets of this Text, he found it expedient to bestow a little of his critical Excellency upon us, in Correcting the Translation of the Church of England, presuming he has equal Authority over it, with the Thirty nine Articles. And,

1. He tells us to our great Illumination, that *ἐκμαθόντες*, signifies not as our Translator renders it, being Taught, but Instructed: A blessed Discovery! Reserved no doubt for the Glory of these last Ages. Poor dull Translators! that could not see the difference between being Taught, and Instructed. But that is the Privilege only, of a Rational Divine, as we shall hear anon, to discern the Essential differences of things; but that none may ever Rob him of the Honour of the Discovery, which is equal to that of the Perpetual Motion, Squaring the Circle, or Doubling the Cube, let it be Written on his Tomb, *Hic jacet primus Author hujus subtilitatis*; &c.

2. He informs us that *ἐν αὐτῷ* signifies not by him, but in him: Well let him make his best of that; for I think he has lost Ground by it: For whereas his Pinching Question is, *How could the Ephesians who never saw Christ in the flesh, he said*

so bear him? he might have added, or to be instructed by him? Now it will be answered, well as to the latter clause, O yes, they may be instructed in him, in his *Nature*; and *Person*, in his *Offices*, in the *End of his Death and Sufferings*, in the *fruits and benefits of his Intercession* with his *Father* for them; Ay, and they might be said to bear him too, when they heard the *Apostles discourse*, and *preach of Him*, open to them the excellency of his *Divine Person*, the meaning of his *holy Precepts*, the *latitude of the precious Promises*; especially the *Rest of the Apostles* were (and no doubt they were) of the same mind with *Paul*, who desired to know nothing but *Jesus Christ*, and him crucified; to *Preach Christ*, a crucified *Christ*, and to *glorify in washing* but in the *Cross of the same Jesus*; and after all, here's not the least invitation to interpret *Christ* to signify *Religion*, *Gospel*, upon this pretended difficulty; that they could not bear *Him*, nor be instructed by him: It's the Delight of some men to make easy things difficult: let the place be interpreted of the *Person of Christ*, and it will hold in the *Gospel*, both in its *Precepts* and *Promises*; and whatever Discoveries are therein made of his *Person*, *Offices*, *Doctrines*, *Laws*, *Government*, *Death*, *Resurrection*, *Ascension*, and sitting at the right hand of *God*, where he makes intercession for us.

Fourthly, It is acknowledged by All (says our Author) that *Christ* signifies the *Church of Christ*. And if he would receive it as an *Alms*, pure charity, perhaps it would be granted; but if he will dispute a right and title to the thing in question, it may go the harder with him. The union between *Christ* and his true *Church* is so near and strict, that they

lure; dissimul. That Christ oftentimes signifies the Person or Nature of Christ, but something else either relating to him, or proceeding from him, is a Metonymie; is plain from those places, where we are said to have received Christ; to have loved Christ; that we ought to put on Christ; and have put him on; to be in Christ; and lastly, to wait in Christ: And at this rate, in a while, the Personality of Christ shall be at the mercy of these men, there being no place of Scripture left that shall necessarily prove him to be a Person; but with one of these evasions they can enervate, and with a half dash of a wanton pen strike him clear out of His Writ. But let us a little examine his Consequence. Christ sometimes signifies the Church, therefore to be in Christ, to be united to Christ, must be so understood. From *It may be in the premises, to mislead in the conclusion; is a high leap,* let our Author have a care he do not break his Neck, for my part, I shall not be too solicitous to answer such Inferences.

But I had almost forgotten, that under the Head, he interpreted *In Christ*, to signify *in the Doctrine*; and now to serve the present Turn, it may signify to be *in the Church*: To which I only say, If they be *one thing*, this Head is needless; and if they be *two*, they make a contradiction.

In the mean time, our Author is the most unhappy man I have met withall, that having perhaps a place or two of Scripture, where possibly the Name of Christ may signify the Church *physically considered* as it takes in the *Head and Members*, the *Foundation and Building*, the *root and branches*, the *Kings and Subjects*, the *Husband and Spouse*; yet should so unhappily fix upon those Texts which would

tempt a rigid Antagonist, to put him to the proof of what in a sober-sence will not be denied. Let us then attend to his Quotations, *Rom. 12. 5. We being many are one Body in Christ.* All true Christians, how many soever they be, constitute but one Body; but how come they to be One, what is that Center wherein they meet; that common Bond or Ligament, which ties them together? who is the Corner-stone that couples together the parts of this Building? The Apostle tells us 'tis Christ; He is the Head in whom the members are united, the corner-stone in whom the sides of the building are joyned, the Center in whom, as in a point, all the Faith of Individual Believers does meet; now cannot they be thus One, but the Name Christ must needs signifie Church? Well, let us hear one of his *Id ests*, i. e. saith he, *We are all but one Christian Society, which is the Body of Christ.* Very good! according to our Authors Fancy, it must run thus, We are all one Christian Society, which is the Body of the Church. But whatever truth there is in the Notion, it never grew upon this root; all the Apostle asserts is this, that *Particular Christians* are compared to the *particular members* of the *natural body*; the *whole Church collectively taken*, is compared to the *natural body*, and that he might shew, how the particular Members of this Mystical Body are united, and become One, he tells us, it is in Christ. Again, *Col. 1. 2. To the Saints and faithfull Brethren in Christ.* Ergo, what? Why they are *Christian Brethren*: True, but how come they to be so? That is indeed the Question; to which our Author speaks *Negry quidem.*

His last proof is from *2 Cor. 5. 17. He that is*

in Christ is a New Creature. It seems somewhat strange to me, that the word *Christ* should signify otherwise in this Verse than it had done v. 14. and must do again v. 18. Before the Text, v. 17. *The love of Christ constrains us, — And that he died for all.* Was it a Person who out of pure Love dyed for his Church? who offered himself a Sacrifice to God for it? and is it all oth' sudden grown a Church? The Church I had thought was the Object, and not the Subject of that Love mentioned. After the Text, v. 18. we read that *God hath reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ:* And how does our Author wedge in Church instead of Christ, in the 17th verse? Must the blessed Apostle be made to speak Non-sence, argue impertinently, conclude absurdly, to gratifie one of his forced and wrested Notions? Well, for once, that we may not purchase his displeasure, let him paraphrase the eighteenth verse thus; *God hath reconciled the Church to himself by the Church.* What remains in this particular, is onely that descant which he gives upon the Text, i. e. Every sincere Christian is a New Creature: Agreed; To be in Christ; and to be a sincere Christian, do explain one another. But the descant upon his descant, is the Life of all; *Whoever professeth the Faith of Christ, and lives in society with the Christian Church, hath obliged himself to live a new Life: Better and better still: What is it to be in Christ?* Ans. *To be a sincere Christian.* Q. *And what is it to be a sincere Christian?* Ans. *To profess the Faith of Christ, and live in society with the Christian Church.* Most admirable: The clearest, fullest, and exactest Definition without all peradventure, that ever was in the world, of a sincere Christian.

*Christi
tere C
onely
and vi
may b
have l
speaks
what
ever.
Ans.
an Ob
New
sure-
men
their
New
T
No
rily
unpr
done
with
ginn
his
som
Ad
con
wh
At
don
nak
in
eye
dis*

Christian; and out-vies all that Mr. *Shepherd's Sincere Convert*, or *Sound Believer* can afford us. The only fault that I find with it is, that the lewdest, and vilest Hypocrite that ever was in the world, may be one of our Authors *Sincere Christians*. You have heard what a *Sincere Christian* is, to your unspeakable comfort no doubt. Will you but hear what the *New creature* is, and you are made for ever. *Qu. What is it to be a New creature?*
Ans. To obligehimself to live a New life. Nay, if an *Obligation*, nay a *voluntary Obligation to live a New life*, will render a Man a *New Creature*, I am sure God has obliged all men so to live, and most men have superadded a *voluntary Obligation* of their own so to live; and then what a sad rout of *New Creatures* is the world pepper'd withall?

The Reader has seen by this time, that his first *Notion* of Christ is false, his second only necessarily True, his third very questionable, and the fourth unproved, and if it had been proved would not have done his work; and now it's high time to draw with him towards a Conclusion. Our Author is beginning to make an end, but he must first discharge his stomach of a little froth, and gall, and spit up some venom that lies in his chest, in the face of his Adversaries, without which he could not possibly conclude his Chapter. He tells you summarily what great feats he has done, and what greater Achievements he will adventure on; What he has done amounts to this; he has discovered great Mistakes in other men's Divinity, but cannot spy any in his own: he can spy a Mole in his Neighbour's eye, but considers not his own Beam. He has also discover'd the rise of these Mistakes, to be from the
various.

various usage of the Name Christ in the Writings of the Apostles. The more excusable (it seems they are, if they had occasion from thence to erre which they might the more easily doe, because (as he observes well) the Writings of Paul are obscure. He has also discover'd to us the temper and humour of those *Miscaken men*: They are zealous to advance Christs Person, to the prejudice and reproach of his Religion, which yet our Author himself, when a Qualm of sweet Nature comes over his Heart, thinks to be Impossible, p. 17. The greater Opinion we have of his Wisdom, and Reverence for his Person, the more sacred Regard we have for his Lawes. He has also discovered a horrid Plot, to introduce a fancifull Application of Christ to ourselves, instead of the substantial Duties of the love of God and Men, and an universal Holiness of Life. But this is but a plot of his own making, unless he had some supernatural Assistances from Beneath. He has also for ever discharged the world upon his Blessing, from closing with Christ, getting into Christ, and above all from overloving Christ, and admiring his Excellencies, and Perfections, his Fulness, Beauty, Loveliness, and Riches. Wherein if he prevail to his mind, he has for ever Obliged the Prince of Darknes to him, and done more service to his black Kingdom, than he with his Legions hath been able to effect these Sixteen hundred years. What he intends further to doe, he has reduced to four heads, to which I referre the Reader; and upon the whole Matter doe onely make this one Observation; That through this whole Chapter, he has cheated and tormented us with a sorry, old, Threadbare fallacy, *A bene compositis ad male divisa*:

divisa: The Persons whom he reviles, dare not put asunder those things which God hath joyned together. They love the Person of *Christ*, and not therefore break, but keep his Commandements. They think that *Faith in our Lord Jesus Christ*, and *Repentance from dead works* are very consistent; may and must sweetly meet together, and Kiss each other. They would be glad to see those who revile them, to love and admire *Christs Person*, and shall be content to be reprov'd so far as they neglect, and undervalue his *Precepts*; but they are not to be frighted out of their Love to Him, who loved them, and gave himself for them: They do freely confess, that they admire at the Love of the Father in sending his onely begotten Son into the World upon such a design as to save Sinners, and they do equally admire the Love of the Lord Jesus Christ, that he was so willing to come into the world, to be tempted, persecuted, reproached, and at last to dye, and give his Life a Ransome for many: And though they have heard many Reproaches and Blasphemies uttered against their Saviour, yet they have not met with one solid concluding Argument why they should not love him: And therefore if they *must be vile* upon these Accounts, they resolve in the strength of Christ to be vile, more vile still; and shall bind all the Ignominy that is cast upon them for *Christs sake*, unto their Temples as a *Crown and Diadem*: For indeed they do persist in that perswasion with some Obstinacy, that it was the Person of Christ who dyed for them; it was He upon whom the Chastisement of their Peace did lye; it was He whose Soul was made an Offering for sin, and upon whom God laid the Iniquities of us All. And therefore our

E

Author

Author must bear with them, if they love him as much as *they can*, because they have reason to fear they shall not love him as much as *He has deserved*. They remember a Dreadfull word, *If any man love not the Lord Jesus Christ, let him be Anathema Maranatha*, and would not for all the world fall under the weight of it. Their love to his person makes them *studious to please him, fearfull to offend him, zealous to glorifie him*, and (if the will of God be so) *humbly content to suffer for him*: They have not met with any Author that has, till of late, endeavour'd a *Confutation of Christs personal Excellencies, perfections, fulness, beauty, loveliness and riches*; and they that have made the Attempt, have expos'd themselves to the universal censure of all that wear the Name of Christian; and therefore they do ingenuously acknowledge, that they doe *admire and honour them*, and do humbly hope, Christ at his coming will not rebuke them for it; And when they are *invidiously traduced* as setting the Person of Christ at oddes with his Gospel, they are satisfied that they have not done it in Principle, and lament that they have in any the least degree done it in Practice: And as they know that the Charge, as apply'd to them, is a *pure, impure slander*; so they conceive it's vey difficult, if not impossible in it self, nor can they apprehend how any can *really and truly maintain a due esteem of Christ in their hearts*, but they must have a *proportionable value and regard* for all his *Commandments and Injunctions*: That these things are, become *Riddles* to any professing the Name of Christ, they tremble at, as a sad symptome that *the Gospel is hid to them, and from them*. They do also in the general

neral approve of any Labours managed with a due regard to the Majesty of God and the Lord Jesus Christ, in order to the discovery of any Expressions in their *Writings* or *Discourses*, which might in the least be misinterpreted to *degrade* and *thrust down Holiness* from its *Throne*; but withall they are unwilling to be railed out of a *good Opinion* of *Christs Person*, seeing that however they may have sinned in *breaking his Laws*, it will not *mend the matter* to *lessen the honour* they justly have for *Himself*; and had rather be *severely chidden for their sin*, than *scoffed out of their Duty*. But of these Matters thus far.

E 2

CHAP.

CHAP. II.

Of what use the Consideration of Christs Person is, in the Christian Religion.

IN the Entrance of this Chapter, I observe our Author is feelingly concern'd to amove from himself the sinister suspition of a Design to render Christ useles. And he makes a solemn Protestation, not onely of his own Innocency, but is ready to become Surety and Compurgator for all his Accomplices. A design (sayes he) which I confess I am wholly a stranger to, as I believe all those are, who are so much charged with it. When we hear a man zealously purging himself of some Notorious Crime, noysed abroad onely in the general, without previous Accusation; it's apt to fly-blow our Heads with jealousy he may be Tardy; an over-forward Vindication being reputed more than half an Accusation. But I dare be one of his Twelve-Godfathers in this matter, that he does not make Christ useles; but will allow him to be of some use, that is to say, that Christ is good for something, and in effect, a little Better than, though next to Nothing; and I can with more security become Bound for Him, because he has given me good Counter-security, that I shall not forfeit my Recognizance. P. 330. I could never perswade my self (no not for your heart, though you had attempted it) that the perfect Obedience
and

and Righteousness of His Life was wholly excluded. So that whatever rendered Christ beloved of God, contributed something to our Acceptation, P. 331. We ought not to think that we receive No Benefit by the Righteousness of Christ. And I hope something is better than Nothing. Nay, (such is his Charity) he can be content to Allow, that God was somewhat more pleased with the Obedience of Christ, than the Faith of Abraham. *ibid.* And that his Sacrifice was of greater value, than the Blood of Bulls and Goats, p. 19. Naughty men are they then, that wrong Him and Them so, as to insinuate that they design'd to make Christ useleſs, the rather because they proceed upon so bad a Ground. We are charg'd with making Christ useleſs, onely because we dare not make his Laws so; And thus it seems they have unhandſomely payd him in his own Coyne, who charges them with making his Laws Useleſs, onely because they dare not make his Person so. And yet to deal plainly with Him, for all this, I find a Double charge upon the File against him.

(1) That though he has not made Christ altogether Useleſs, yet he has made him Needleſs. Though he can use Him, yet he could have spared him; though he can make a shift with him, he could have made a Rubbing shift without Him. *Ut scum possum vivere, sic sine te.* So p. 46. I should rather have thought that Gods requiring such a sacrifice as the Death of Christ, was not because he could not do otherwise. And if Gods Justice could be contented without that sacrifice, I may presume it shall not stick at our Authors good Nature, p. 43. Had Christ never appeared in the World, yet we had Reason to believe that God is thus Wise and Good, viz. to

Pardon sinners. And (as he labours to Prove) Enoch, Noah, Jews and Gentiles, who knew nothing at all of Christ, p. 44. yet understood God to be a God pardoning iniquity without him: And surely if the World jogg'd on for four thousand years without Christ, it might have worn out the Remainder without him too.

(2) I find a second Charge against him: That though he make not Christ useless, as to some common, ordinary and general Ends, which might have been attain'd, and reach'd without him; yet he renders him wholly Useless as to those special, those main and glorious purposes for which he came into the World: The making satisfaction to Divine Justice, the Imputation of his Righteousness to Believers, his powerfull and effectual sanctifying them by his Spirit for whom he undertook. Whereof we shall meet with abundant Evidence in the progress of his Discourse. So that a Declaration contrary to the Fact, is of small weight with considering Readers, and sinks it self below all consideration. But to return: Two things fill up this Chapter.

First, That the Person of Christ is of some Consideration; and Secondly, That the consideration of his Person is of some use, onely the difficulty to be assoyled by His Abilities, is, Of what use, the consideration of his Person should be?

[1.] Then, the Person of Christ is of some consideration; but ere he ventures upon that Province, he bethought Himself it would be a Task worthy his great Parts, to indoctrinate our Plumbeous Cerebrosities in the Nice Point, What the Person of Christ is? P. 13. By the Person of Christ I mean, what all men ought to mean, (nay there's no doubt

of

of that; All men at their utmost Peril ought to mean, to a hairs breadth, just as our Author means) *Christ Himself*. Had it not been a *Prodigy* as great as ever was in the World, if by *Christ's Person* had been meant any body else? Such then is *Christ's Person*. The Consideration thereof follows: And (as he assures us) the onely proper consideration here is the Greatness of his Person; This is the onely, or however, The onely Proper, or at least the onely Proper consideration here; whatever other improper considerations of it there may be in other places; or cases, upon other accounts, or occasions, at other times, it skills not; for Here, at this Time, and in this place, the onely Proper Consideration is the Greatness of his Person. And yet methinks, the exceeding loveliness of his Person, standing betwixt God and lost Sinners; his laying down his Life as a Ransome payd to God, his standing as a Surety in our stead, his bearing our sins in his Body on the Cross, might have claimed a Place, and come in for a share in our consideration of his Person. But thus much for that.

[2] The Use of this consideration follows. And some good Use he has assign'd it.

(1) And first, it's a plain demonstration of Gods love to Mankind, that he sent so dear, and so great a Person into the World, as his onely begotten Son, to save Sinners. It is so indeed, but a very weak demonstration of Gods Love to his own Son, to send him into the World, to grapple with all those Miseries he met withall in his Soul, in his Body, from Enemies, from Friends, from Men, from Devils; nay, from himself, whom he pleased to bruise him, and lay upon him the Iniquities of us all, to make

his soul an Offering for sin, nay, to be made sin for them, who himself knew none, to Die a cursed Death, and all this without any Absolute, or Indispensible necessity: *Contrary to all the Rules of Decorum; Nec Deum interit nisi dignus vindice nodus incidat.* And it would be of use to consider also the Love of Christ, his Willingness to Accept the Terms of being a Redeemer, though He knew well they were severe, and would cost him Sweat, and Blood, and yet He cheerfully Undertook, Underwent, and went through with them. He voluntarily assumed a Body, that He might become a Sacrifice, Heb. 10. He was willingly for a little while, made lower than the Angels by Dispensation, who was above them by Nature, for the Suffering of Death, Heb. 2. 9. He understood well the Debtor was Insolvent, and yet he became Surety; He knew well the Righteousness of God, and yet He was ready to put in sufficient Caution, to Declare his Righteousness, to Clear, and Vindicate it, that God might be Just, and the Justifier of them that should believe in Him, Rom. 3. 25, 26. These things would have had their Use; but alas, this Head was brought in by the Shoulders, only to make way for more of our Authors excellent Theology. Religion is the Theam he has singled out to practise upon; and he considers it first in General, and then in its particular Species.

(1.) For Religion in General. 'Tis founded (says he) on a belief that God is, and that he is a Rewarder of them that diligently seek him, Heb. 11. 6. That this is a Postulatum, somewhat to be presupposed in all Religion, is easily granted; and and no more can be necessarily inferred from the place.

Place
God,
hence
is r
their
proac
what
where
the I
own
what
God
them
no F
self-c
and y
may
ing o
comm
of al
it, b
to th
tells
whic
the
Chri
(
ligio
he r
the
Mo
Reli
ses,
For

Place. All Religion does suppose the *Existence of God*, and that it is not in vain to seek Him: But if hence our Author would conclude, that *nothing more* is required as a Foundation for Sinners to Build their hopes of *Acceptation with God*, in their *Approaches* to him, and *Service* of him; he gathers what the Apostle *strewed not*, and *Reaps what*, &c. *where he Sowed not*. There are no *Infidels in Hell*, the Devils believe God to Be, and Tremble at their own Belief, wishing they could persuade themselves, what they have persuaded others, that there is no God: They know too that God is a *Rewarder of them that diligently seek him*, and yet they have no Foundation to come to God. A *despairing Cain*, a *self-condemned Judas* may know this to be a *Truth*, and yet not seeing a *Mediator*, through whom they may securely come, and find *Acceptation* in their seeking of Him, they dare not, they have no ground to come; but if this be in very Deed the Foundation of all Religion, why durst not our Author *Trust* to it, but flie (as *Bellarmino* to his *Tutissimum est*) to the Lord Jesus Christ: For, pag. 15. He freely tells us, *That the Foundation of his Hope, is that which is the Foundation of the Christian Religion, the Sacrifice and Intercession, of our Lord Jesus Christ.*

(2.) For the Sorts, and particular Kinds of Religion, he is pleas'd to Instance only in *three*, but he might as well, would he have Created himself the trouble, have named *Threescore*. A *various Mode*, or *Circumstance*, does not Constitute a *new Religion*: It may appear in *various Garbs* and *Dresses*, be represented under *other Oeconomies*, and *Forms*, and yet continue the same for *Substance*.

The

The Ocean as it salutes differing Shoars, falls under divers Denominations, yet is but the same vast Body of the Sea: There may be many false Religions (*Error is Multiform, Truth is Uniform*) but as to any that can plead for acceptance with God, there never were but Two: That of *Integrous and upright Innocent Persons* in Paradise; and that other of *Sinners* retrieved and brought back to God by a *Mediatour*. But I attend his Motions.

First, *Natural Religion* (as he says) is founded on the natural Evidences of the Divine Bounty and goodness, in making, and Governing the World. I now see my Errour, and it's well it is not too late. He had told us, pag. 14. That Religion in its first Natural Estate, knew no Priest nor Sacrifice nor Mediatour. Whence I innocently concluded, that he spoke of a State of *Pure and uncorrupt Nature*, which indeed knew none of these; but I see I was but Chouff; for here we have a *Natural State of Religion*, on this side the general Revolt from God, below the common Apostacy of Mankind, a *Sublapsarian Posture* of Affairs, which yet is a meet stranger to Priest, Sacrifice, and Mediatour, founded on Natural Evidences of Divine Bounty and Goodness. To which I humbly offer: That these *Natural Evidences* were not, could not be a Foundation firm enough to bear the weight of the Religion of sinners in their Return to God, so as to render them secure of Acceptation with him. For, 1. Those natural Evidences could not assure the guilty World that God would enter into a new Covenant with them, nor Treat with them upon other Terms, or upon another Account; and as to the old Terms, they were Lost as to any hope by them. This we see plainly

plainly in *Adam*; Who when he had sinned, and Guilt Recoyled upon his Conscience, in stead of Returning to God, he became Vain in his Imaginations, thinking to flie from him that is Omnipresent; or to Abscond from him that is Omniscient, he takes Covert in the Trees of the Garden; and he gives this Reason, *He heard the Voicē of God, and was afraid*: And yet I see not but 'twas as Rational a course, as to think of Returning to God, when in that Covenant wherein he had stood, and now had broken, there was no provision for an After-game, or salving Matters by Repentance: The Law he had Violated in the Sanction thereof, tells him he must Die. Natural Evidences from Creation or Providence, or present Patience, and Reprieve, spoke nothing, till Supernatural Evidence came in, in that Protevangelium, the Oare and Bullion of Evangelical Discoveries, *The Seed of the Woman, shall break the Serpents Head, Gen. 3. 8, 9, 10, 15.* But, 2. I say that Natural Evidence would discover only common Goodness, and general Bounty, which God might afford the sinner, without any security that he should not Perish eternally. 3. Whatever Evidences man might have that God made the World, which were Pregnant enough, yet the Evidences that God did Govern the World would afford him but cold comfort: Seeing that the Righteous Governour of the World could not be supposed by any other Laws or Rules to Administer it, than those he had given at first; which being now broken, and the Creature withdrawn from Gods Order by Disobedience, what could Natural Light discover, but that God would Reduce the Creature again into Order by Punishment? 4. Nor could the Evidences

of

of Gods *making the World*, give any Glimps of Assurance, that first or last he would not *destroy* (though at present he *suspended the Execution*, upon a Secret Design of Grace lodged in his own Bosom) unless a *Mediator* had *Interpos'd*, and that *Interposition Accepted*, and both *Revealed* to those Consciences which were fill'd with hideous Apprehensions about the Holiness of God.

Secondly, The *Mosaick Religion* was founded on those *Miraculous deliverances* which God wrought for Israel, and that particular Providence which watched over them. To which I return: 1. The *Mosaick* and the *Christian*, are not different Religions, but one and the same for Substance, differing in Ceremony and Circumstance. What they saw, that we enjoy: They had *Christ in Sacrifices*, and we have all their *Sacrifices in Christ*: What they had at sundry times, and in divers manners, that have we in one Uniform way by *Christ*: They had scattered Particulars, we have them all sum'd up in one, Heb. 13. 8. *Jesus Christ yesterday, to day, and the same for ever*. 2. The *Miraculous deliverances* which God wrought for Israel; were indeed Cogent Motives, super-added to those many others vouchsafed them, but not the Foundation of their Religion under any Notion: When God gave the Law upon Mount Sinai, He Prefaces it with this strong Inducement; *I am the Lord thy God, which brought thee out of the Land of Egypt, out of the House of Bondage.*— *Thou shalt have no other Gods before me.* May we now upon our Authors Warrant, say, That Gods *delivering them out of Egypt*, was the Foundation of their Religion in Worshipping the true God, and none besides Him;

Him;

Him; or rather that it was an *Additional Enforcement* to command Obedience to that Law, which yet *Antecedent* to such particular *Obligation*, approved its *Authority* to their *Consciences*? But that these *Deliverances* and *Providences*, were no Foundation for the *Mosaick Religion*, I shall endeavour to prove.

1. In that God himself declares, that he had laid another Foundation, *Isa. 28. 16. Behold, I lay in Zion a sure Foundation*: And this is not *constitutive* of what was *New*, but *declarative* of what was *Old*; not only a *Prophecie* of what he would do, but a *clearer Discovery* of what he had done; that he might lead them into *stronger Expectations* of that *Messiah*, which from time to time was promised would come, and in *fulness of Time* should come; and this Foundation God laid in *Zion*: Which though it may express the *Gospel-Church*, yet surely must not exclude the *Jewish*, to which the Name *Primarily* appertains.

2. In that God had actually laid another Foundation, from the Foundation of the World, for sinners to Build their Hopes upon in their addresses to God. Thus was Christ the Lamb, slain from the Foundation of the World, *Apoc. 13. 8. Slain particularly in the Sacrifices*, which commencing with the *New Covenant*, ran a Line parallel with the *Old World*, to the one great Sacrifice of Christ our High Priest upon the Cross. In that first Promise then made to our first Parents, and afterwards Amplified to *Abraham*, was the Foundation of all acceptable Religion, and Worship, *Gen. 12. 2, 3. God promises to Abraham: In thee shall all the Families of the Earth be blessed*; which promise that it

it contained Christ, the Apostle assures us, *Gal. 3.* The Scripture fore-seeing that God would justify the Heathen through Faith, Preacht before the Gospel to Abraham: In thee shall all the Nations of the Earth be blessed, ver. 16. Now to Abraham and his Seed, were the Promises made; he saith not Seeds, as of many, but as of one, and to thy Seed which is Christ. Now unless we will find out *Quintum Evangelium*, that has nothing of Christ in it, Abraham had Christ, for he had the Gospel Preacht to him; and I do not understand what Gospel signifies without Christ. Our Author, I'm sure (of all the Men under Heaven) has Reason to allow it; for he would have Christ signify Gospel, and therefore cannot blame us who would have Gospel to include Christ, because we are loth his Person should be quite shut out of it. And again, The Promises were made to Abraham; And is it so strange that Promises should be made to him, and he not understand one word of them? What was the Foundation of Abraham's, was the Foundation of the Jewish Religion: Nothing at all in their Service or Worship, could plead for Acceptation, but as it came under the Influence of those Types which were of no value in themselves, but upon the account of Christ. In *Levit. 6. 1, 2, 3, 4.* If a Soul sin, and commit a Trespass against the Lord, &c. I cannot but give the Reader, a Breviate of some Remarkables in this Scripture. 1. That the Sins here mention'd, were not ceremonial Pollutions, legal Defilements, but such Wickednesses as were discoverable by the Light, and condemned by the Law of Nature: Lying, Cozening, False swearing, Unfaithfulness in Trust, &c. 2. That these

these f
ence,
there
Obnox
quet i
ver. 1
the L
sinne
Fact
which
decei
to ke
restor
more
notw
he m
Rom
as ve
fer it
ing v
7. I
next
gives
Tres
we c
crisi
Paul
the l
And
bloo
con
Res
wh
We
in C

these sins did bring a proper Guilt upon the Conscience, as being committed against the Lord; and therefore the Sinner was guilty before God, that is, Obnoxious and liable to his Displeasure, and bound over in conscience to answer it at Gods Tribunal; ver. 1. If a Soul sin, and commit a Trespass against the Lord; ver. 4. Then it shall be because he hath sinned and is guilty. 3. That for that part of his Fact which was Injurious to his Neighbour, that which he violently took away, or the thing he hath deceitfully gotten, or that which was delivered him to keep, or the lost thing which he found; he was to restore the principal in Specie, and to add a fifth part more, because of the *Damnum emergens*. 4. That notwithstanding he had thus compounded with man, he must bring his Trespass-offering to the Lord; a Ram without blemish, ver. 6. 5. The Priest was to receive the Trespass-offering at his hand, and offer it up to the Lord. 6. The design of this Offering was Attonement, procuring Favour from God. 7. Here's a Promise of the full Pardon of sin, annexed unto this Sacrifice, ver. 7. It shall be forgiven him, for any thing of all that he hath done in Trespassing therein. Now upon the whole Matter, we observe here was Pardon of sin annexed to a Sacrifice; and yet their Reasons could tell them, as Paul has told us, Heb. 10. 4. It's not possible that the blood of Bulls and Goats, should take away sin: And I think we may venture to say the same of the blood of Rams too. How shall these then be Reconciled? I know no other way, but by owning the Respect which they bore to the Lord Jesus Christ, who was from the Foundation of, and all along the World the only Lamb slain, of value for these ends, in Gods Account.

Thirdly,

Thirdly, *The Christian Religion* [is founded] on the *Incarnation, Death and Resurrection, of the Son of God*. Our Author had founded his own, and the *Christian Religion* on the *Sacrifice, and Intercession of Christ*, p. 15. But perhaps, *fearing or finding the Foundation too narrow*, has here widened it at the *bottom*, and taken in the *Incarnation of Jesus Christ*. But I hope now the *Storm* will blow over, and the *Indignation* conceived against those Persons who *Love, Honour, and admire Christ's Person, a little Slake*; for if their Religion, the *Acceptation of their Persons and Services be built upon Him, as Sacrificed for them on the Cross, and Interceding for them on the Throne*, they do judge it their duty to love him against the World. Nay, what will you say if our Author himself should become a *Convert*; his own *Hope*, and that's his All (he says) is Built on the *Sacrifice, and Intercession of Christ*: And can you imagine but he should *Admire, and Adore his Person*? And then may there not arise a danger that he should *set up a Religion of Christ's Person*? However that goes, This I know, it was Christ's blessed Person, that endured the *Shock*, and *abode the Storm* of that Displeasure which was *due to our sin*; and no Reason can be assigned, why a Person should endure *all the Sorrow*, and not have also the *Love, Honour, and Admiration of them* for whom he endured it: And if *some few Holy men* be a little *Transported* with the *Love of Christ*, methinks it's easily pardonable; *very few* die of *that Disease*; no danger *this Age* should be *Hot in the fourth Degree of Love* to a Redeemer, that our Author should be necessitated to Write a Book for fear it should *Poyson us*: For my part I meet

meet with no such *Paroxysms* of Divine Love, that his *Julip* should be so much cry'd up; but I would fain please my self with this, that whilst he seems *Frigidam suffundere*, his Real Design is to make us all more in Love with Christ by a Spiritual *Antipristas*.

(2.) This gives great Reverence and Authority to his Gospel, that it was Preach'd by so Great a Person as the Son of God. And therefore whilst he is in the good Humour, let him Retract those Severe and Toothed Satyrs, wherewith he has Torn and Lash'd those poor Honest Men for loving his Person; but Neglecting his Laws; when he tells us here, *The greater Reverence we have for his Person, the more sacred Regard we have for his Laws.* Perhaps he was then under an Accession of Gout, Stone, or Cholick, or some of the peevish Distempers, which made him so Testy, and Teachy, with his best Friends; but now he's a little come home to himself, he's in as Sweet, Treatable, and Debonaire a Humour as one could wish, if it would but last. I confess, some may think that *All this* is nothing but a Complement which he passes upon Christ's Person, or a little Holy-water he sprinkles in his Face; and that there Lurks a Snake under these fair Flowers. — For he plainly makes Laws and Gospel, Edequate, and Commensurate Terms. This gives Reverence to the Gospel, [for] Laws always partake of the Fate, and condition of the Law-giver: The Gospel as Contradistinguish'd to the Covenant of Works, denotes the glad Tidings of Salvation by a Mediatour, or the joyful News that there was Forgiveness with God, that He might be feared. As contradistinguish'd to the Old Testament-
F
state,

state, it is the glad Tidings of the Son of God sent into the World, that taking upon him our Nature, he might therein become a Curse for us, and by his perfect Obedience to the Law, might Purchase and Procure Eternal Life: And are Christs Laws and His Gospel become Convertible? Is there no Revelation? No Promise? Nothing done for us, which cannot come under the Nature of a Law? The Laws of Christ then are Holy, and Just, and Good; that the Greatness of his Person Conspires Reverence, and due Regard to them we acknowledge; that Law and Gospel are words of equal Extent, we deny, and do think our Author will be harder put to it to prove Christ to signify Law, than to signify Gospel: Much less are we satisfied in his Comparison. Numa pretended he received his Laws from the Goddess Egeria, to procure a greater Veneration to them. Thus God, &c. Say you so? Did God procure Veneration for his Laws with such a cunning Trick, a *Pia fraud*, as Politick Numa did? Or is Christ grown an Instrument of Government, as he tells us hereafter Gods Justice is? Well, I hope he Meant honestly, or else it will be somewhat hard to be tied to Mean just as he Means.

(3.) The Greatness of his Person gives great Authority to his Example, for he came to be our Prophet, and our Guide, to Teach us by his Precepts and his Life. Believe it, this is something like? The World is well amended since pag. 5. For then Preaching the Gospel was the Exercise of his Regal Power. And now here he has brought it into Decorum again, and at present is under a Pang of Modern Orthodoxy. But his Example gives us an Evi-

dent

dent Demonstration, wherein the Perfection of Humane Nature consists; for he lived up to the Perfection of Humane Nature, and the only way to be Perfect is to Live as he Lived. Why then, I doubt, we must never be in any sence Perfect all the days of our Lives; for in the very next Page, he proves, That Christs becoming Poor, though he was Rich; a Servant, though he was Lord of Life, are such Expressions of Love as we can never fully Imitate; and so Adieu to all Perfection to the Worlds end. It was, indeed, Prudently done to Imitate the Wisdoms of Nature, to Plant his Antidote so near his Poyson, that if he scatter'd Infection in one Page, to fortifie our feeble Spirits against the Impressions of it in another. A little Observation will Dismiss this Period. And,

1. One would think that to live as Christ lived, was not so much the way to Perfection, as Perfection it self. Your dull Syntagmatical Divines use to distinguish between the Means and the End; or the way to the Wood, and the Wood it self; but great Spirits are above Pedantick Laws, and therefore to please all Parties, for once let the way to be Perfect, be to be Perfect.

2. I observe that the Scripture owns some to be Perfect who never lived, all out, nay, nothing near so well as Christ lived, 1 Chron. 13. 17. The heart of Asa was perfect all his days; and yet we read, that In his Disease he sought not to the Lord, but to the Physitian; he took not away the High places; he was wroth with the Prophet Hanani, and put him in Prison; and yet perhaps our Author can Evade, That notwithstanding this, he might come up to his Pattern; for Christ himself, once or twice, put on

the Person of a Jewish Zealot. There was then a time when a man might have been perfect, and yet not Live up to the absolute Perfection of Christ, but I perceive *its lost*, and is to be numbered amongst the *Resperdita of Pancirol*. To conclude, How far Christ is to be Imitated, is a Question of greater Difficulty, than at first sight may be Imagined. Some Works he performed as God, others as Mediatour, and others as a Man. *Those which he performed as God*, the Miraculous Operations of the *Deity*, none need be *diswaded* from Imitation of; for no stronger a Reason, than because 'tis Impossible: To Raise the Dead, cast out Devils, Cure Diseases with a Word, or Touch, are Matter of our *Admiration*, not *Imitation*. I know, indeed, some of our *Modern Schoolmen*, will tell us, That though we cannot Imitate Christ herein *to the height*, yet we may imitate him *as far as we can*. Thus though *Raising the Dead*, be a little too Many for you, yet you may come to the Grave of your dead Friend, command him to come forth; but if he be *Sullen*, and will not stir hand nor foot, let him take his Course, and lie there still like *his Grace in cold Clay clad*: You have done your Duty, and may *satisfie your Conscience*, that you have Imitated Christ *as far as you can*, by as Useful a Figure as any is in *Rhetorick*, called *κακογνία*. The Works which Christ performed as *Mediatour*, though we cannot Imitate them for those *special Ends* which Christ had in *His Eye*; yet must we Imitate that *Moral principle from which*, and the *General End unto which*, he Levelled those Actions: Thus we cannot Die for *that end* for which Christ Died, *especially to Atone sin*, yet may

may we, *must* we Conform our Souls to that *Love* which carried him out to the Work, and Eye the *general Advantage* of the Church, in laying down our Lives when called to it, 1 John 3. 16. *Herein perceive we the Love of God, that he laid down his Life for us, and we ought to lay down our Lives for the Brethren.* And the Argument concludes strongly: If *Christ* [a Person so great] laid down his Life, [a Life so precious] for us [so unworthy] and in such a way to be a *Propitiation* for our sins; how much more, ought we [Inconsiderable Creatures] to lay down our Lives [so useless] for the Brethren, [so dear to God] when our single Death, may by the Providence of God, prevent some *Impending danger*, or notable Ruine, that Threatens the Community? So again, Col. 3. 13. *As Christ forgave you, so also do ye.* We are to forgive, as Christ forgave: And yet the [As] is a Note of *Similitude*, not of *Equality*: *Christ's forgiveness* is one thing, *ours another*; they differ *Specifically*, yet there's a *Moral equity* which holds, that if Christ freely pardons our sins, much more ought we (*in our way*) to *pass by*, and not Rigidly exact those Trespasses committed against us. But the Actions of Christ, as a Man Living in Obedience to the *Moral Law*, and especially that Frame of Cheerfulness, Readiness, Sincerity therein, *these* call for our Imitation.

(4) *This assures us of the Infinite value of his Sacrifice, and the power of his Intercession.* I have heard some Travellers, when they have met with a spot of good way, after long *regions* lapsing in the Dirt, say, they could be tempted to *ride it over again*, but the consideration, *how long they have been, and*

how soon again they must be engaged in wayes of the same difficulty, has reformed the vanity of that *Croquet*. I could gladly dwell upon some pleasant passages in this Chapter, (which prove undenyably that there's no such thing as *summum malum* in the world,) but that I am importun'd by the approaching foul way to make haste into it, that I may get the sooner through it. *Sun-shine* is pleasant, but it often proves a *breed-storm*; and a *Dead calm* in our Master *Aristotles* Philosophy is the *Prognostick* and *Prodrome* of an *Earth-quake*. But yet why should we kill our selves for fear of dying, and make our selves miserable for fear another should do it for us? We will then make the best we can of the present *Halcyon tranquillity*: This assures us of the Infinite value of his Sacrifice, and the Power of his Intercession, 'Tis so indeed; for though the *Manhood* onely was the Sacrifice, yet the *Person God-Man* was the Priest; and though the Sacrifice was not God; yet was it the Sacrifice of him who was God; none can therefore wonder that our Author calls it of Infinite value. Nor on the other hand let any surmise, that he uses the Term *Infinite* to impose upon us; though some perhaps may carry a jealous Eye over him, because he has dropt an *odde word* or two elsewhere which seem to warp the sence of *Infinite* to *Finite*, or *Indefinite*; In p. 208. he denies that the *Divine Nature* is self hath endles, boundles, bottomles *Grace* in it; Though God be rich in *Grace*, he hath no where told us, that his *Mercy* was bottomles and boundles, (which yet is that Notion of Infinite that we have ever Received) and yet the same Author, in the same Page, will allow *Grace* to be Infinite. A world of sin is somewhat,

what, though it bear no Proportion to infinite Grace. Hence I perceive some would inferre, that if the Grace of the Father may be infinite, and yet not boundless, the Blood of the Son may be so too, of Infinite value, that is, of a great uncertain worth, in which sence Vorstius will allow God to be Infinite: They do also foment their own suspicion from what here follows, as it were by way of Exegesis: His Sacrifice was of greater value than the Blood of Bulls and Goats. Nay then, if there was onely a *Magis* and a *Minus* in the case, all this might be, and yet Christs Sacrifice come infinitely short of Infinite. These things may be objected, but for my own part, (though he be angry at it in other places, when he is not concerned) I shall interpret his words according to their *Chime and clink*, and charitably expound his meaning by the sound of words.

That which follows is Truly excellent. God cannot but be pleas'd, when his own Son undertakes to be a Ransome, and to make an *Atonement* for sinners, which is so great a Vindication of Gods Dominion and Sovereignty, of the Authority of his Laws, the Wisdom and Justice of his Providence, that he may securely pardon humble and penitent sinners, without reproaching any of his Attributes. What pity 'tis a single word should here be lost.

I. God will not, indeed cannot, pardon any sin to the reproach of his Attributes. The hopes of sinners are small, if these be their hopes, that to pardon them God will destroy Himself: It would be the reproach of pardoning Mercy it self, should we conceive it ready to pardon without respect to the Interest of other Attributes. As therefore God is ready to par-

don, a way must be contrived that he may securely pardon; and when 'tis said [he cannot] 'tis no Impeachment of His Omnipotency; He is therefore Omnipotent because he cannot Doe some things, the Doing whereof would imply want of Power. He cannot Dye, and is therefore the rather Omnipotent, because he cannot: He cannot Deny himself, and therefore he can doe all things, because he cannot doe that; for he that can Deny Himself, his Word, Promise, or Threatning, may be presumed Able to doe very little: Thus therefore God cannot pardon sin, without security that his Attributes be not reproached, for so to doe, would argue a Remisseness, and languid easiness in a Governour which is a weakness, and no perfection.

2. We gather from our Author, That even humble and penitent sinners need the Interposition of Christ, that God may securely pardon them: for besides that even they are but imperfectly such, and that sin still cleaves to their Repentance and Humiliation, and further that the displicency of God against sin, as it is sin, small or great, is essential to Him; besides all this, those however humble and penitent ones, turning from sin for the future, have yet old scores to discharge, former Reckonings to clear, and have need of Christ to cross the Book for old Arrears, though for the time to come they should reach the *Axel Godingaw*; which yet it's much to a little, they will not doe: but when Christ undertakes to be a Ransome, God may securely pardon humble and penitent sinners, and not till then.

3. In pardoning of these humble and penitent sinners, Gods Dominion, Sovereignty, and the Authority of his Laws must be vindicated: for God be-
ing

ing the
he dif
niven
gent
cut a
Right
mise
person
perpet
thus:
all the
to doe
our A
is ver
have
done
Lord
Agree
with
with
Cesar
another
Civil

Illu
Co
H
At

4.
some,
blood
and f

ing the Righteous Judge of all the Earth, should be discover a facile Indulgence, and indifferent connivence at Sin, the Authority of his Lawes were gone in a moment, and the sinews of Government cut asunder; God then must be declared to be a Righteous God; the Sanction of the Law, as to Promise running thus; *Doe this and live*: Doe this personally, doe this exactly, doe this constantly and perpetually, and then live; and as to Threatning thus: *Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things that are written in the Book of the Law to doe them*, Gal. 3. 10. And of the same mind with our Author is, (as I remember) one Dr. J. O. who is very peremptory, that the Justice of God may have its actings assigned to the full; which is not done by Any that ever yet was heard of, but the Lord Jesus Christ: Now whilest I see the sweet Agreement of these two at present, I fancy my self with Æneas in the Elysian fields, pleasing himself with the Amicable correspondence held between Caesar and Pompey; and yet his delight mixt with another passion, even grief in the foresight of their Civil Wars and Friendly Debates.

*Ille autem, Paribus quas fulgere cernis in Arpis,
Concordes Anima nunc, & dum nocte Premuntur,
Heu! quantum inter se bellum, si Lumina Visa
Attigerint, quantas Acies stragemque ciebunt?*

Æneid. lib. 6.

4. Jesus Christ having undertaken to be a Ransome, and to make Attonement for Sinners, and his blood being of Infinite value, the oldest, greatest, and stubbornest Sinners, through Faith may possibly come

come to be concern'd in Christ's Ransome, and Redemption, and so may be saved with a Native standing their sins; for seeing Gods Dominion, Sovereignty, the Authority of his Laws, the Wisdom and Justice of his Providence, are all vindicated by this Means, and security given that none of his Attributes shall be reproach'd, what can Now hinder repenting sinners from coming to God? and what can hinder God from rewarding those that so come, and diligently seek him? Nay,

5. God cannot but be well pleas'd when his only Son undertakes to be a Ransome, and to make Redemption for sinners. And the Reason is evident, The price being of Infinite value, and pay'd into Gods hands, he cannot but be satisfied with it. Nay further, We can Reasonably desire no greater security for the Performance of the Gospel-Covenant, than that it was sealed with the Blood of Christ, the Surety of a better Testament, Heb. 7. 22. who is *Egyptus*, one that undertakes for the Performance of it. I could willingly lose my self, my Reader, and my Time in the Throng of these good words. Say not; This is only the Sealing of a Covenant on Gods part, undertaking for him whose veracity needs none to undertake for it; but not for us, whose guilt and weakness needs an undertaker. The Covenant being mutual, the undertaking must be supposed Reciprocal also; and so I hope our Author intends it; that as Christ undertakes for God, with Man, so he undertakes with Man unto God. Perhaps you will say, A word or two might have been added, to have put matters out of dispute; why there might in any bodies Writings besides his, and as many spared, *hanc veniam petimusque damusque*.

As 1. It's likely you would have had him say, The
 Vertue of Christs Sacrifice depends not onely very
 much on the Greatness of his Person, but Altogether,
 and the Acceptation thereof with God depends on
 the Compass between them both; seeing that which
 depends altogether, does depend very much on the
 Greatness of his Person; and therefore pray let that
 break no squares. 2. Whereas he sayes, "The
 Blood of the Son of God, is such a Confirmation
 of the Covenant, as the World never had before.
 Perhaps you would add *Actually*, because the World
 had it before *Vernally* exhibited in Sacrifices, and ac-
 cepted as already Performed: But set your hearts at
 Rest, whether he meant well or ill in this Chapter,
 I'll engage you shall not be prejudiced, if he hap-
 pens to discover an ill meaning in the next Chapter;
 and in the mean time, let us go seek all over *Paule*
Church-yard, Little-Britain and Duk-lane, for an
 old Treatise, *De modo tenendi Anguillam Equivo-*
cationis per Caudam.

(5) "The Person of Christ is of no other Con-
 sideration in the Christian Religion, than as it has
 an influence upon the great Ends of his Under-
 taking. I confess, I had thought, our Author had
 not been upon the Head, *What Consideration the*
Person of Christ is of? but, *Of what Use the Con-*
sideration of his Person is? but let that pass. I had
 thought too, that the former four particulars had
 shewn us, *What influence Christs Person has upon*
the great Ends of his Undertaking; and therefore
 this seems not to be a fifth Particular, but the sa-
 me summe of the other four, but I wave that too.
 The Lord Jesus Christ undertook both with God and
 with Man; for God, and for Man, and he had spe-
 cial

cial Ends of his undertaking in both. He undertook for God, that he should be willing to pardon sinners; and for man, that he should return and come back to God: He undertook to God, that his Attributes should not be reproached, but all secured his Righteousness cleared, his Holiness vindicated: he undertook to man that God should make every word and letter of the Promises good, as they stand in the Covenant of Grace: He undertook that Gods Justice, should not break out upon the believing, repenting creature, to consume him; and he undertook that Man should not break in upon Gods glory, nor break away from Gods Wayes, in a manner inconsistent with a New Covenant. What a horrible Absurdity then must it be, to imagine that his Person will destroy these Ends, or to expect more from the excellency of his Person, than his Gospel has promised. Most wretchedly therefore doe they deceive themselves, and wrong the Redeemer, who Trusting to the goodness of his Nature, Renounce his Mediation; that trust in his Person without a Promise, may in contradiction to the Terms of that Covenant which he hath seal'd with his Blood; that quit his Promise, to rely and rowl on his Person: For should he acquit those men whom his Gospel condemns, wofull and incorrigible sinners, this would flatly annull the Covenant: Though he may absolve such sinners as the Covenant of Works condemns, through the Intervention of Christs Sacrifice.

But I perceive we are besides the Cushion all this while, nay besides the Book, for he knows none that will in so many words own it, nor does he, dares he charge any man with it; but yet it's the natural interpretation of Trusting in the Person of Christ.

That

That is, *It's impossible to Trust in Christs Person;* but you doe *ipso facto* Renounce his Mediation: or to Trust in his Blood, but you must so *Nowine* doe it in Contradiction to the Terms of the Covenant sealed therewith; or which is all one, it's impossible but that things subordinate should be opposite; The blood of Christ and the Covenant of Christ are perfectly *adversum*; The Person of the Mediator, and his Mediatory work cannot be conceived, but they involve the thoughts in a thousand Contradictions; *Positio unius, est Remotio Alterius*; Nay soft sayes he, I onely mean, in case they understand any more by these things, than expecting to be saved according to the Terms of 'the Gospel-Covenant.' I do not think they doe. And as our Author gave his word for those that are suspected to make *Christs Person useles*; if my word would go as far as his, I would readily engage it for them who are suspected to make *his Laws useles*. And so once again, *all is Husht and still*; and the fearfull skirmish that was towards, is at present stinted, *Pulveris exigui jactū*.

Let me therefore in the Close, give our Author one *wholsome Caution*: That he would not be too rash and peremptory in drawing, or wracking Conclusions from other mens Expressions. Some will think, he has mistaken in his own, and may with more ease in others Principles, and the Conclusions from thence. A Ladder of Deductions and Inferences forty Rounds long, is not easily master'd: A Sorites or Climax may quickly impose upon us; we are never sooner cheated than in a Chain of many links, the smallest interruption may secretly and insensibly discompose the whole series and

con-

concatenation of Dependencies, wherein we saw
an infallible Connexion; I would not anticipate
Hericano; ill weather comes *unfens* for; and
always too soon, and *unwelcome* when it comes
the latest; let us therefore keep our selves well
whilest we are well.

Thus *smoothly* we conclude; and say,
Here ends your Worships Chapter for the Day.

CHAP.

T
Beggs
Parce
a M
caries
of Pa
often
Cabin
Wor
dy S
prom
Hope
Baffle
serve
fitch
Knoo
does
Use
Chil
the p
to th
while
small

CHAP. III. Section I.

Of the Knowledge of Christ.

THIS Section allures the Eye of the Reader with the specious Frontispiece of the knowledge of Christ, but proves a mere *Mock-Beggar-Hall*, and *Fools Expectation*, like a *Fair Porch* to no *House*, or a *great Mountain* without a *Mouse*; just like the *Guiled Titles* of *Apothecaries Boxes*, which pretend to *Lodge the rich Drugs* of *Pontus*, and both the *Indies*; but are *Inhabited* often by the *Poysonous Spider*, and *Hung* with *Cobweb-Tapistry*, *Spun* out of her own *Bowels*, and *Woven* with her *curious Fingers*: Or like those *gawdy Signs* which *Encounter* us upon the *Road*, whose promising *Motso* first *Invites* the *Traveller* with *Hopes* of *Horse-meat*, and *Mans-meat*, and then *Baffles* his *hopes* with *Entertainment* that would *serve* a *Dog*: To see our *Author* *heaving* for a *far-fetched Blow*, you would verily think he *Design'd* to *Knock* the *Business* *stone-dead* for ever; whilst he does but *Imitate* the *Black-smith*, that would needs *Use* the *great Sledge-Hammer* to *Kill* a *Flie* on his *Childs Fore-head*, and very *Discreetly* dash out the poor *Infants Brains*. Leave we him therefore to the *Satisfaction* of his own *private Thoughts* a while, and let ours give the *Readers Patience* a small *Exercise*.

The

The *Happiness of Man* consists in the *Knowing* and *Enjoying* the *True God*, blessed for ever; and therefore *He*, who is *never wanting to his own Glory*, nor to His *Creatures Happiness* (in such ways as best Comply with His own Unsearchable Wisdom) first *Created Man*, and then gave him an *Understanding to Know*, a *Heart to Love and Enjoy* His Creator: Admirably proportioning his *Faculties* to his *Employment*; and as he made it his *Work and Wages to Love and Serve*, he furnisht him with a *Soul qualifi'd to Love and Serve his God*: But when *Man had sinned*, and thereby lost his *Fitness* for that blessed Service; it pleas'd God to enter into a *New and better Covenant* with him, *Establisht* upon that Promise, *Gen. 3. 15. The Seed of the Woman shall bruise the Serpents Head.* God would not suffer Satan to *rejoyce too much in his success*, and *glory in his greater hopes*, that he should *sway* the *World* before him, and *draw the rational Creation* into the same *Ruine*, into which he found himself *Irrecoverably Plunged*. The Father had *Divided* to the *Redeemer a Portion with the Great*, and Promised He should *Divide the Spoil with the strong*, and *Wrest* out of his hands that *Advantage* he had gotten over Man *by sin*, and the *Curse* inseparably annex to it: In the Faith of this Promise, had *guilty Man* encouragement to *Return to God*, and not *sink down in black Despaire*, to which, the *Reflections* he must needs make upon that *Cursed state* he had so *cheaply* brought himself into, could not but *Expose* him. And though the *Generality* of the *Sons of Men* through their own *sinful Neglect*, Lost the Faith of that *first and precious Promise*; yet the *Gracious God* took *Effectual Care*, that his

his Service and Worship should be carried down in a chosen Seed and holy Line, from our first Parents, by righteous Abel, heavenly Enoch, upright Noah and others, to believing Abraham, to whom he was Graciously pleas'd to vouchsafe a more Distinct and Explicit Revelation of the Promised Seed: And whereas before, all Families of the Earth might equally pretend to the hopes of it, Now God Clears and Secures it to his Faith, that in his Seed (by the Line of Isaac) should all the Nations of the Earth be Blessed. In pursuance of this Promise, and the glorious Design managed thereupon, he Renews in a more Solemn, Ample, and full Manner, the Covenant of Grace with him, the Epitome, and Abstract whereof was this, Gen. 17. 7. *I will be thy God.* And for the greater Security, adds Circumcision, a Seal of the Righteousness of Faith, Rom. 4. 11. As the Family of Abraham was branched out into two; so we observe how the vigilant Eye of Providence Traces that Line, by which He had fore-appointed to Conveigh so Rich a Mercy as a Redeemer, down to the following Generations: And accordingly he Hedges it about with special Care; Waters it with extraordinary Blessings; Impales it from the Common and Wild of the World, by distinguishing Ordinances, that it might get a fixed Root in the Earth. Hence was Ishmael waved, and Isaac taken into special Protection; Esau excluded, and Jacob comes under the peculiar Cognizance of God; just as the Stream and Current of the Promise found its proper Channel, and the other Old ones grew either Shallow and Inconsiderable, or quite Dried up. For the better Securing, and more prosperous Managing this great Project, God was

also pleased to cast the Posterity of Jacob into a visible Church-frame, and Political Model, appointing to them a Ceremonial Law as an Appendix to the former; and the Judicial Law as an Appendix to the latter Table of the Moral Law, accommodating so the whole, that all might lead to Him who was indeed the whole life and Soul of that Administration; An High-priest and other inferiour ones he also instituted, with great variety of Sacrifices and operose services, (arising from the beggarliness and poverty of all Types) fully to represent the Messiah; in whom they did more abundantly meet; yet herein might they (as in a Glass) eye a Redeemer, and in him, God appeased, sin pardoned, and their Persons justified, and accepted; The satisfactory Reason whereof lay onely in him, who was the Lamb slain from the foundation of the World, in Gods Acceptation, and representation to the Faith of Believers. Now whilst God did thus Train up the Jewish Church, in the hopes, and expectation of a Deliverer; he offered also to others of the World, (though forfeiting Gods especial Notice by the general revolt, and common Apostacy,) a joynt Interest in those priviledges stated and settled upon the Judaical Church as her Dowry, provided they would come under the bond of the Covenant, and join themselves to the people of God, and thereby attend the great Ends and reach of Divine Grace, to save sinners by the Intervention of the seed of the Woman. And further, to leave some standing hints upon Record, that in due time he intended to throw open the hedge, and let the Gentiles into the Priviledges of the Jews, (who seem'd the Monopolizers of all true Religion, and Worship)-it has graciously pleas'd

pleas'd the same God to reveal to some few others out of the *Purlieus* of that Body, as to *Job*, the Doctrine of a Redeemer, as early pledges to the World, that those favours should not alwayes lye under *Sequestration*; How miraculously God preserved this Church and State, is needless to insist on; but remarkable was his Care over *Judah*, that though she had *justifi'd* her sister *Samaria*, and *out-done* those in *sin*, whom she had *out-gone* in *Mercy*, yet when the ten Tribes were *hurried* away into Captivity; God remembered that *ancient Promise*, that *Scepter and Law-giver* were not to depart from *Judah*, till he that *should come*, was come: and therefore notwithstanding as *heynous provocations* (all Circumstances considered,) and *proportionable dangers*, as ever yet exposed a people to utter ruine, still *Judah* lived: And though the Holy God in *Vindication* of his *wronged Honour* before the world, was concern'd to *visit* their *Iniquities* with a *Seventy years* Captivity in *Babylon*, yet still he kept a *fixed Eye* upon the *Tribe of Judah*, and especially the *Family of David*, to which (e're this) the producing of the *Messiah* had been *entail'd*. And it was not for Nothing, that after their Return, they were so *precise* and *punctual* in their *Genealogies*, that there might *no scruple* arise in after-times, when *Christ* should come, but that he was of the *Stock* of *Abraham*, of the *Tribe of Judah*, of the *seed of David* according to the *flesh*: In contemplation of which *stupendious design*, the wisdom of its management, his *Arm made bare*, to *second* and *back* the work, how the Great God preserved the *Jewish Policy* from utter dissolution, till it had done its work, and *reem'd* the *Messiah* into the World; and when

that was done, how all things conspired for its dissolution; how the greatest Convulsions and Earth-quakes, which would have unbinged other Kingdoms, and have thrown them from their Consistency, yet made that Common-wealth take deeper root, whilst God would serve himself thereof, and when he had no more service for that Tribe, how it was scatter'd; How Providence marvellously secured the Vessel (in the midst of those waves which the Malice of Hell endeavoured to lift up as high as Heaven) wherein the Salvation of the World was embarked, and when it had once safely landed a Saviour in the habitable parts of the Earth, where his delights had been, how the Ship sprung a leak, and sunk of it self: These things make me (with the Divine Herbert) pause, and say,

*How dear to me, O God, thy Counsels are!
Who may wish thee compare?*

But our Authors lips do not like these Lettuces: Two things he industriously sweats at in this Section: First, To shew us, *Wherein Happiness consists*, and then to inform us in the *Way and Means to reach that Happiness*; A glorious Undertaking indeed; wherein though he should founder, yet an Attempt has its praise, and may at least plead for *Phætons Epitaph*,

Quem si non tenuit, Magnis tamen excidit Ausis.

It was *Austins* Censure of the *Platonists*, *Patriam viderunt, Viam ignorârunt*: They were convinc'd that true Happiness must needs consist in enjoying the True God. The chiefest Good, τὸ ὄν, αὐτοῦ, ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν ὄν.

A

A Being, Self-being, Essential being; but they were wretchedly bewildred in finding out the way to the enjoyment of him; and for all their skill could never double the Cape of good Hope. Where Plato ended, our Author begins, *Ubi desinit Philosophus, incipit Theologus*; and wherein he fail'd, he undertakes to write his Supplement.

[1] Then (though there be less need of that) would you know wherein true happiness consists? you are answer'd, *In the Knowledge and Love of God, who is the greatest and best Being*. If he means the utmost happiness Mans Nature is capable of, it wants a word or two; This Knowledge must be a perfect Knowledge, and this Love, a perfect Love; and to this Knowledge, and Love of Man to God, you must adde the Sense of Gods Love to, and delight in Man, and Mans reciprocal satisfaction and complacency in God as his Portion. It's a tedious Question bandyed amongst the School-men, wherein the Formale of Blessedness lyes; some contend for the Vision, others for the Love of God: but he seems to me to have determin'd best, who has joyn'd both; *Felicitas hominis consistit quidem in Visione, sed Charitativa; & in Amore, sed Oculatissimo*. The Happiness of Man consists in the most Loving Sight, and in the most Seeing Love of God; but the Controversie will not lye here.

[2] For the Means of Reaching this Happiness, he assigns this; *God hath made known himself and will to the World*. Our Author is now obliging Posterity with a Discovery of the North-east Passage to China, and the Indies; the old way round about Africa is tedious, and dangerous, and therefore let him not want the Trade-wind of your Prayers, that

he meet not with Sir *Hugh Willoughbies* Fate, whilest he attempts to make out a shorter Cutt. Now concerning this, you must understand; That God who is never wanting to his own Glory; and the Happiness of his Creatures, hath taken care in all Ages, by one Means or other to make known himself, and his Will to the World. Our Author presumes he has penn'd this Discourse with much Artifice, and laid a train of fallacies for us, which if not timely discovered, and prevented, will irrecoverably blow us and our Cause up into the Aire, in the next Section: But indeed the best part of his Policy is the confounding of things, and involving them in such Intricacies and Perplexities, that it's much harder to discover his Errors, than to confuse them being once discovered; like what Physicians tell us of the *Hettick Fever*, that in its first Rise it's hardly discerned, but otherwise easily cured; and at length easily discovered, but then impossible to be removed; according to the French Proverb, *Toutes les maladies, termines en Ique, font aux Medecins la Nique*. And therefore, e're things are gone too far, and we be given over by *Æsculapius* himself, as those whom *safety* it self cannot save, let us try if we may prevent a growing evil.

And (1) it stumbles some I perceive, that he layes the Happiness of Mankind in the Knowledge and Love of God, and then the Means to that End in making known himself, and his will; which looks as if the Means and the End were coincident, and the knowledge of God, were the way to know God.

(2) He supposes that God has by one Means or other made himself known: by which Means, if he understand no more than the lowest Agents, and
sub-

subordinate Instruments, it will not doe his works; and we can grant what will not serve his Cause; but if he exclude the Son of God, who is the Sovereign Revealer of the Fathers Counsels in all Ages; that we shall not grant, and that he cannot prove.

(3) We are more dissatisfied about this one point, that he makes the *Revelation of Gods Will* a sufficient Means for Happiness, to all Ages: for though it were granted to have been so, in the state of primitive Integrity; yet it's not so in those Ages when the whole world lay in wickedness. The Spirit of God describes the state of Sin, to be a state of Impotency. Rom. 5. 6. *When ye were yet without strength, in due time Christ dyed for the ungodly:* There must goe something more (then) to make the Means sufficient to attain that End, than a Naked discovery of what God would have Sinners doe, even strength and ability to doe it; for the Will of God was, and is the same; *Doe this and live*; and if strength be not afforded to fulfill this Law exactly (which none could ever yet find) nor a Substitute allowed, (which some will not accept,) Man may, and must perish as well with, as without the discovery of Gods Will; with this onely difference, that he sees now his sin going before him unto Judgment.

(4) It's very vain to talk of Mans tampering about doing the Will of God, in Order to Eternal Life, till some means be found out to rake up the old Controversie; and make a peace betwixt God, and his Creature, that they may treat upon other Terms; We are sure Adam thought it so; And the first in its kind may well be allow'd the just measure of all after Attempts; who when he had sinn'd, went

and hid himself; at once discovering both his *Rational fear*, which was to stand before God; and his *foolish contrivance*, which was, to hide himself from God in the Covert of the Trees, under which (nay under Rocks and Mountains) it had been more comfortable for him ever to have shrowded his *guilty Face*, had not God revealed the *postliminary means* of conversing with him.

(5) We think our Authors Reason is as lame, as his Assertion, viz. Because God is never wanting to his Creatures happiness: To which I return,

1. God will not have his Goodness impeached, because he exerts it such a Way, Method, and Measure, as seemed good to his own infinite wisdom, and sovereign pleasure: If any shall dare to charge God foolishly, I doubt not he will acquit himself well enough; but if he will plead his *Prerogative*, he can demur to the Jurisdiction of the Court, and refuse before the Barr of Imperious and sawcy Reason, to give an Account of any of his matters, Job 33. 13. But,

2. God did create man upright at first, and if he departs from the Law of his Creation. I know not whether an Action will lye against his Goodness, should he leave him to perish in his Apostacy; A Father is not bound to set up his Son, as oft as he will shut up shop and become Bankrupt.

3. God was not wanting to the Happiness of his Creature when fallen; but did provide a remedy for him, and remembered him in his law, in his lost Estate, because his mercy endured for ever: but then 'tis upon another Account than this Assign'd by our Author: for he supposes, That Gods not being wanting to his own Glory, and not being want-

ing

ing to his Creatures happiness, stand upon one and the same level, in equal terms of Necessity: but I suppose quite another thing; God had not been wanting to his own Glory, could have secur'd that well enough, though Man had perished, though he had never revealed a Mediator betwixt God and Man: And that he has done it, is to be ascribed to a Sovereign Act of Grace. But I see what things are vowing to: *Deum non erit Deus, nisi homini placuerit*: God shall not be God, unless he approve himself to every Caprice of a Rational Divine; who has two peculiar Privileges, and incommunicable Properties; one, that he may call whom he will Irrational; and the other, that he may canonize whom he will for Reason.

4. I'll throw him in a little one. Although he tells us, God is not wanting to the happiness of his Creatures, and therefore by one means or other he revealed himself to the World: yet he also acquaints us, p. 30. Long and sad experience proved all these ways ineffectual: And as good never a whit, as never the near; For all this was but rubbing a Brick ball, and putting a Blackmore into a Leather, and so we are but just as we were; for though he was not wanting to them, yet it seems, wisdom was wanting to Him, whose Contrivances did not attain their Ends; and thus our Author has spun a fair thread; I'll onely mind him of the Epigram:

*Turpe est difficiles habere Nugas,
Et stultus labor est Ineptiarum.*

Having discoursed these things in general, it's a fine sight to stand by, whilst our Author is dividing

ding the World into *Provinces*; and its *several Apartments*: And you shall hear him (not dispute, but) with the *Cartesian*; *Provincias dare Atomis*, or split a single *Cummin-seed* into four and twenty equal parts.

(1) For the state of *Integrity*; How God was not wanting to his *Creatures Happiness* therein, he informs you at large. "He left such visible Impressures of his own Wisdom and Power on the works of Nature, and planted in the Mind of Man such a Natural Knowledge of himself, that it was as easie to discover the first Author of all things, as it's now for a well disposed Eye to see the Sun when it shines, and while Man preserved his Innocency, God Himself did not disdeign to converse with him. And so I hope Adam is well provided for: Some may think, that we are here less agreed, and others that we are more of a Mind than indeed we really are. I shall not take notice of that Phrase of *conversing with God*, it looks as if it were neer a kin to, and well nigh as bad, as that of *holding Communion with God*, which he afterwards shrowes up his Nose so scornfully at: Some other matters may have a Room in our Consideration: As,

[1] That this *Knowledge of God* was *Natural*, had need be a little better trimmed than ordinary: *Natural*, either imports what is *constitutive* of our Beings, or flows immediately from the *Principles of Nature*; or else what is *congruous*, and agreeable to our Natures, as designed for such an Employment as is proper to them: If he take *Natural* in the first sence, I softly deny that; *The Knowledge of God which made or would have made Adam happy*;

happy
that
diat
separ
Being
Dove
const
know
their
physi
veste
if by
that
love,
to b
and
be
Know
best
foun
and
gian
[
ral
Hap
but
tha
upo
wa
I.
ous
Re
an
an

happy, was *Natural* to him: And my Reason is, that what does so constitute Nature, or flow immediately from the Principles thereof, cannot possibly be separated from that Being, but withall, the very Being is *destroy'd*; but we see *damned Souls* and *Devils* retain all that knowledge of God, which did constitute their *Essences*, and yet have lost all that knowledge of God, which is or may be a *Means* to their happiness; they retain their *Beings*, are not physically stript of them, though they are *Morally* de-vested of all the *Comfort* of their *Beings*: but then if by *Natural Knowledge*, no more be intended, but that upon *supposition*, God would create man to *serve*, *love*, and *enjoy* him, it was due to a Being so *posited*, to be so *qualified*: If man must *serve* his *Maker*, and in that *service* enjoy him, and in that *enjoyment* be *Happy* in him, then indeed is it *natural*, such a *Knowledge*, such a *Will*, such a *Heart*, should be bestow'd upon him; but I would have this Bush soundly beaten by a better Huntsman than my self, and ten to one, he may from under it start a *Pelagian*.

[2] It would be enquired, whether this *Natural Knowledge* was a *sufficient means* for *Adams* Happiness? Our Author seems clearly to assert it, but I confess I cannot joyn with him, as believing that much more was required of, and indeed bestow'd upon him than a *Natural Knowledge* of God. He was made in the *Image*, and *likeness* of God, *Gen.* 1. 26, 27. A main part of that *Image* lay in *Righteousness*, *Eccles.* 7. 29. God made man upright, *W*: *Rectum*; there was a *Rectitude* of all the *Powers* and *Faculties*; an exact conformity of them to one another; and of all to the *Revealed Will* of God; And

And this appears, In that *the Image of God* restored by Grace, assures us *what that Image was* which he once had, but since has lost, *Eph. 4. 24.* And that ye put on the *New Man* which after God is created in *Righteousness, and True Holiness*: And indeed, the first man not being capable of a *forreign Righteousness*, whereby he might be justifi'd, (that Covenant either not needing it, supposing he had stood, or not admitting it, on supposition of a Fall) he must necessarily have a *Righteousness inherent*, one of his own, to qualify him to hold Communion, or (to speak warrantably with our Author) converse with God.

[3] I question much that Expression of *Innocence*, as not very *Innocent*; it has been taken upon suspicion many a time, and sometime could not give a good Account of it self. *Casti quidem sed non credita*: And it has been the more narrowly observed, since a *Generation of Men* arose in the world who would perswade us, That *the Perfection of Man in his first Creation, lay not in any positive Qualities of Holiness, Righteousness, and Truth, but in a bare Freedom from sin*; That is, they would fancy Man to have been created as *pure white* and *Innocent* as a *sucking Lamb*; but not so much as the *first preparative blue* towards the *tincture* of any *Vertues*; but whether this *one word* in our Author, may be interpreted *so high*, time must discover. And hitherto of the State wherein God created Man.

(2.) A *second Period* of Time into which our Author has Thrown the World, is that from *Adam* to *Abraham*, inclusively. Upon which Interval he Philosophizes even to our wonderment. *In after-Ages as Mankind grew more corrupt, and declined*

to Idol
or impi
deadly
withou
might
found
find hi
none c
invade
wiss-e
a way
Cause
Evil:
from
fobb'd
in aff
corrup
and er
Ages
throu
there
none
Traci
Head
Men
they
that
there
woul
thou
Gen
into
pass
have

to Idolatry. Here I want our *Authors Accuracy*, or must complain of a *Fallacy*; for methinks it's a deadly long stride, to step from *Adam* to *after-Ages*, without the *Bridge* of some *Neat Transition*; he might have made *two steps* of this: just now, we found Man in the *state of Innocency*, and now we find him *corrupt*, and *declined to Idolatry*, and yet none can imagine how this *evil of Sin* and *Misery* invaded the world: The *Heathens* were at their *wits-ends* about it; the *Manichees* could not invent a way to asswage it, but by assigning a *double Eternal Cause*, or *Principle*, the one of *Good*, the other of *Evil*: And now when we expected great matters from this Gentleman, to be left in the lurch, and fob'd off with a *blind account*, that this was done in *after-Ages*; In *after-Ages* as *Mankind* grew more corrupt: Oh! it seems they were *Corrupt before*, and *enclined to Idolatry*, but in these *villanous after-Ages* they grew more *Corrupt*; Religion pass'd through *many hands*, and in long *Tract* of time gathered *Moss* and *Furze*; Men sliding *insensibly*, none ever knew how, into this degeneracy; and Trace it up as high as you can, yet *Nilus* hides his Head beyond the Mountains of the Moon: That Men are corrupt and stark naught we see, but how they became so, or when first turn'd out of the way, that's hid in *darkness* and perpetual *Night*. But there is one *St. Paul* (as obscure an Author as some would represent him) that would have spoken a thousand times more to our satisfaction than this Gentleman. *Rom. 5. 12. By one man sin entered into the World, and Death by Sin, and so Death pass'd upon all men, in that (or in whom, i^e q^d) all have sinned. V. 17. By one Mans Offence Death reigned*

reigned by one. V. 18. *By the Offence of one, Judgment came upon all to Condemnation*: That the evil that we experience in the world (and that's abundance) may be reduced to two heads, it's either *Malum Culpe*, or *Malum Pœna*: Either the Evil of Sin, or the Evil of Punishment for sin. Now this Excellent Author tells us, that both these Evils came from one root, one spring, and that was one Man; and that one Man was Adam; This seems to have a probable face of the Origine of Evil, but he was a dark Writer. There is therefore another Author, that wrote a Book called, *The Catholick Doctrine believed and professed in the Church of England*; one with whom our Author has some Reason to be acquainted, for a Reason or two that I know of; now this Author tells us, Art. 9. *Of Original or Birth-sin*, That, "Original sin standeth not in the following of Adam (as the Pelagians vainly talk, N. B.) but it is the Fault and Corruption of the Nature of every Man, that Nature is ingendred of the Off-spring of Adam, whereby Man is very far gone from Original Righteousness, and is enclined to evil, so that the Flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and therefore in every person born into the world, it deserveth Gods wrath and damnation. I promise you here are a great many terrible words, that would not be doffed of with a Flim-flam of Mens growing corrupt in after-Ages; for this Article is positive, that All that are naturally engendred of Adam have a corrupt and faulty Nature; Abel as well as Cain; Jacob as well as Esau; and Isaac as well as Ishmael; Such however then was their State: Now what Means did God afford the Men of this Generation, that he might

might
pines
Some
were
Very
how
evil-
brought
but to
leave
and;
Let
Art.
"Ad
"him
"W
"fore
"sant
"of
"Wi
"Go
"Go
"wh
"Car
"with
"ing
"Crea
"himse
"what
"to ac
"they
"for fa
"of G
"perha
"might

might not be wanting to his own Glory and their Happiness? Why you must know in the first place, that some of the Men of this Age were good Men; others were corrupt, declined to Idolatry, and degenerate: Very good; but then one would long to know, how the Good became so; for how the evil became evil, we are satisfied; every one engendred of Adam brought with him a corrupt and faulty Nature; but for the other sort, these good men, our Author leaves us as much in the dark how they became good; as he did before how those other became evil: Let us consult that excellent Author last Named, Art. 10. "The Condition of Man after the Fall of Adam, is such, that he cannot Turn, and prepare himself by his own Natural Strength and good Works, to Faith and Calling upon God; wherefore we have no power to do good Works, pleasant and Acceptable to God, without the Grace of God preventing us, that we may have a good Will, and working with us when we have that Good Will. But let us go on. God afforded Good Men the frequent Apparitions of Angels, who were the great Ministers of his Providence. Carry this one thing in your heads as you goe Along with my Author and me, viz. That he is demonstrating, That God in all ages was not wanting to his Creatures happiness; but by one means or other made himself, and his will known to them. Now then, what did these Angels appear to these good Men for? to acquaint them with his Will? why it's supposed they knew that before; else how became they good? for such they could not be, without the Knowledge of Gods Will, antecedent to their Obedience, though perhaps they might have stumbled upon some Act
materially

materially the Command of God; as a Blind Man by Chance may catch a Hare: what then? to present them? Protection required not Apparition: what then? to carry some occasional Errand from God, wherein they were concern'd to be instructed, upon the emergency of some extraordinary Providence? Very true; but not at all to his purpose: but I shall have no more Concern herein than to move a few Quæries.

1. It may be enquired, what Angel it was that Ordinarily appeared to the Patriarchs of old? the rather because he is peremptorily called *Jehovah*, the Essential Name of the True God: And I find some have pleaded that the Second Person of the Trinity, by way of *Prælude* to his future Incarnation, to shew that his delights were with the Sons of men, and how ready he was to do the Will of his Father in the Redemption of the World, when in the fulness of time, a Body should be offer'd him; and their Pleas have not been removed, and they are somewhat confident cannot be. And as I remember amongst many other, they insist upon *Hosea* 12. 3, 4, 5. He took his Brother by the heel, and by his strength he had power with God; he had power over the Angels, and prevailed, he wept and made supplication to him, The Lord God of Hosts, the Lord is his Memorial: יְיָוָה אֱלֹהֵי הַצֶּבֶא אֹתוֹ, יְיָוָה וּכְרָו. If this was not the True God blessed for ever, that wrestled with Jacob, an Atheist will bid you prove there's a Better than the Lord God of Hosts, whose Memorial is *Jehovah*; if it be; then he was also the Angel that appeared, and who could that be but the Second Person?

2. It may be asked I hope without offence, (supposing

posing that Created Angels did (as sometimes they did,) appear to good Men, and that their Message was the *Mind of God concerning their Happiness, and Blessedness in the Enjoyment of God;*) whether they preach'd any other Gospel than they preach'd to the *Shepherds at Bethlehem*: because it would seem, that these inferiour Angels could not employ their Tongues upon a more welcome Theme, than *Him, who was their Head, and under whose Obedience they were Ranged by Creation, and to whom he was also a Mediator of Confirmation.*

3. It might deserve Consideration, How far Angels are the Ministers of Gods Providence? That they are *Ministring Spirits sent out to minister unto them who shall be Heirs of Salvation,* (Hebr. i. last,) we thankfully believe and own; yet God has not left his *Inspection* into, or oversight of this lower World: This looks like some *New Divinity, new vamped up from the old Epicurean Philosophy,* which represents God as living at ease and enjoyingly in Heaven, and not concerning Himself, (for that would they think disturbs his Peace,) with the *Brangles and Contrasts* of Men, but Rules all by the *Court of Delegates.* For the Good men, we shall not need to be too solicitous how they did, doubtless they would shift well enough in the world: All the difficulty is, about the Degenerate, how God carryed it towards them, that he might not be wanting to their Happiness? Now here indeed our Author helps at a dead lift. Two Expedients he used:

First, The *Preaching of some eminent Persons,* such as *Enoch, Noah, and Abraham*: And herein we cannot but admire the *wisdom* of God in the Old World,

H

that

that he sent none but *Righteous Men* to preach *Righteousness*, to an *unrighteous generation*. To vapour against sin, and then to wallow in it; to forbid our *Patients* that *Food* which is often found upon our *own Trenchers*, will not gain much credit to our *Doctrine*, and therefore Christ, *Acts 1. 1.* is said first to *Do*, and then to *Teach*: Otherwise Ministers words are look'd on as *things of Course*, to while out one *Glass*, that they may be readier for another: Such Preachers being like him in the Comcedian, *Qui alterâ manu fert lapidem, panem ostendit alterâ*, that is, he feeds his *Auditors* like *Apes*, with a *Bist* and a *Knock*: But here are a few things upon this head, that we cannot pass by, for our Author is as full of Excellencies as an *Egge* is full of *Meat*.

(1) Here has been good *Provision* made for *Good men*; and pretty good too for the more degenerate part of *Mankind*; but there's a middling size of Men, all this while, that have no care taken of them, sink or swim: Men, that your *Papists* will tell you, are too good for *Hell*, and too bad for *Heaven*, but of a just *Gage* for *Purgatory*: Now these men did not need such extraordinary *Helps* as *Noahs*, and *Abrahams Sermons*; nor could deserve the apparitions of *Angels*, and therefore they must be content to drudge through the work in their own strength, whereof having a sufficiency, enough is as good as a feast, & *Frustra fit per plura quod fieri potest per pauciora*.

(2) What *Righteousness* was it that these Men preach'd? Surely it would have been a hard Venture to have preached to them Their own; for if *Mans Nature* be *Corrupted*, and he lyable to Gods *Wrath*,

Wrath, and Damnation, as the Church of England determines; it will be very difficult at least, to bring such a Righteousness to God out of so vitiated a Nature by its own mere strength, as may plead acceptance with him: That Righteousness which is the Result of our utmost Obedience, has some flaws in it, that make it very improbable to justify any person in the world under our Circumstances, that is, Sinners. 1. That Obedience which we may plead and abide by before God, for Justification and Eternal Life, must be entirely our own; performed in our own strength: it were idle presumption to come to God, for Acceptation and a Reward for that which we are beholden to his Grace and strength to help us to perform. 2. That which is not absolutely perfect cannot justify in the face of a perfectly holy Law, and an infinitely perfect holy God. For if any thing short of Gods demands, would serve to justify a Sinner, what should hinder but that, seeing God is infinite and absolute in Mercy, he might abate the whole? Nay indeed, if God can abate, and come down from his first Terms, who shall set the Dice upon his Grace and goodness, and say; Thus far shall Mercy goe in Abating, and no further? And in a little while, no doubt, this Doctrine will be so well improved, that we shall have it made as plain to us, How God may justify all the Debauches of the World, as a Repenting Sinner; if no respect be had to the Satisfaction and Interposition of Another. But of these things abundant occasion will be administred for Debate in the following Papers.

But then Secondly, there's another Expedient, which God used to reclaim the more Degenerate

part of Mankind, and that he tells us was *the good Examples of good men*; how they lived, and how well they sped by Holy Living, and how they were rewarded, and how happily they dyed, and how much God delighted in them :: All this is True in it self, *Enoch's Translation, Noah's Preservation, Abraham's Exaltation, and Lot's Ereption*, were *convincing Arguments how dear these good Men were to God*: But first I would say, it was a more Convincing Argument to me, that God was Good to them, who made them so, who call'd *Abraham* from *Ur of the Chaldees*, from the Idols which his Family had worshipt on the other side the Flood: It was Gods Grace that raised up the Righteous Man from the East, and call'd him to his foot, *Isa. 41. 2.* And then secondly, I would say too, that there wanted something more than outward Examples to make that Age happy, even an inward Operation of Gods Grace; for the Church of England has excellently resolv'd, *Arr. 10. The Condition of Man is such after the Fall of Adam, that he cannot turn—without the Grace of God preventing him, that he may have a Good Will.*

(3.) We are now arriv'd at a third Division of Time, stretching it self from *Abraham* untill *Christ* came in the Flesh. For when the World would not be reformed by single Examples, (as ye know one Swallow will not make a Summer,) what did God dō then? why he chose the Posterity of *Abraham* to be a publick and constant demonstration of his Power, and Providence, and Care of Good Men. Our Author fancies that God had been trying Conclusions, and casting matters in his thoughts, how he might reform the rugged World; and that he might

might be sure to hit o'th' right way at last, he ventur'd first upon *single Experiments*, and then upon *Experiments in Consort* (just like my Lord *Verulam*) and yet none of them would come up to the designed End. I have heard of one that would needs trye how to make a *dead body stand upright*, he set him upon *his feet*, and placed him in *his true perpendicular*, yet still he *crancht* i'th *hams*, or one mischief or another, he would not stand; at last tyred out with his *fruitless labour*, he gave it over, concluding all was not right *within*, there was some *wheel or pulley, some spring, or string broken*. Just such a process does our Author modestly ascribe to the great and wise God. He supposes God was not wanting to his *Creatures Happiness*; and I may suppose God knew well, what would serve to answer his *Creatures Happiness*, in the present posture he was in; and yet all came to little or nothing, surely there's something wanting somewhere or other. But there never comes better on't, when men will proceed upon a false ground, and tyle over one *Aburdity* with another, that their *Errours* may not rain through: Therefore,

1. God was never disappointed in the *Counsels* and *purposes* of his heart; whatever he undertakes according to the *good pleasure of his will*, he goes through with it; If he will work, none shall let; If he sayes it, he will doe it, and his word shall not return to him in vain, but accomplish the thing for which he sent it: Thus *Enoch's, Noah's, Abraham's Ministry* atchieved whatever his hand and *Counsel* fore-ordained by them should be done; And if any be angry hereat without a Cause, they must be pleas'd again without amends.

H 3

2: God's

2. Gods *varying* the dispensation was not because he found it *ineffectual*, *contrary* to his hopes, but because he would make *all* these *Providences* comply with his *grand Purpose* of conveying the *Messiah* to the World at last. He takes this Family, the Posterity of *Abraham*, to be his *Peculiar*, and as any *branch* of that Family lay out of the *Road* of *Christ*, he left it to take its loss in his more general oversight and care of his *Creatures*; That *branch* of this *Root*, which was to bear the *Messiah*, *always* was kept alive, and the rest, in process of time wither'd, and fell off, of themselves. But there was an *odde word* dropt from his Pen at unawares, that had like infinitely to have *ravel'd* all his Affairs, and to have quite marred the *Musick* of this Paragraph; had he not been aware of it in due time: He had said, That *God chose the Posterity of Abraham*. Now you know that the World is *wide enough*; and *Choosing* in its first *Notion* implies, the *taking* of one, and *leaving* another; and, how to make that sadge with some other *Cross-Capers* he has in's Head, was a Matter worthy his thoughts, and *simously* to be reconciled, which he has thus done: When *God chose the Posterity of Abraham*, he did not design to *exclude* the rest of the World from his *Care* and *Providence*, and all possible *Means* of *Salvation*. That *God* did *exclude* the rest, or any part of the World from his *Care* and *Providence*, I suppose none are concern'd to affirm, but they who are for *God's governing the World by his Courtiers* onely, and *great Ministers of State*: That *God excluded* the World from all possible *Means* of *Salvation*, is an *Idle Dream*, when indeed they *excluded* themselves. When *God* gave the *Promise* to the

Common

Common Parent of Mankind, there was a Possibility in the Thing, that that Means of Salvation might have been derived to all those Rivers into which his Posterity should be subdivided; and if it was not, I conceive the fault was theirs, not Gods: and all that I know will be proved hence is, That it's marvellous dangerous to venture the Concerns of another World upon the Credit of Oral Tradition; for if it proved treacherous when the Lives of men were drawn out to such a length, what may We expect from it, whose dayes are but as a shadow; But if indeed the World lost that Promise, its Encouragement and Warrant in drawing nigh to God, I doe not, cannot see that God was bound to repeat and renew it every Thirty or Forty years, to every particular Kingdom, Nation, Countrey, and the Individuals therein, for fear of being wanting to his Creatures happiness: and I have some hopes that our Authour will shew himself friendly in this business, for he tells us, p. 33. That Now, the only true Medium of knowing God is the Knowledge of Christ, who came into the World to declare God to us. Has God then excluded the rest of the World from all possible means of Salvation? or, Did the Gospel of Christ come into every Nation, in every Age, and to every individual Man and Woman of that Age, or else must we say that God is wanting to his Creatures in not affording to them, but excluding them from all possible Means of Salvation? But further, God hath maintain'd a Church in all Ages of the World, where the Means of Salvation have been enjoy'd, and there was a possibility of being interess'd in the Priviledges and Advantages of that Church; for so sayes our Author, p. 29. The rest of the world

when they pleased, might fetch the best Rules of Life from Israel: And in all probability, if it was possible to fetch any thing from them, it was as easie to come so, and joyn with them: and then again, it was as easie every jot, to fetch other means of Salvation as the best Rules of Life. But I am afraid, we do not discourse *ad idem* all this while, perhaps he may reckon upon those to be sufficient Means of Salvation which we think insufficient to Man under his present Circumstances: Let him therefore set up for himself, and prove if he be Able, That the knowledge of so much of the will of God as may be known from the works of Creation and Providence, is a sufficient means for the saving of Mankind (in any Age he will pick out) considered as represented by the Church of England, in her Ninth Article, and he shall either have a just Confutation, or a speedy Recantation.

One Text of Scripture he judges will doe his work: Rom. 3. 29. *Is he the God of the Jews only? is he not also of the Gentiles? Yes of the Gentiles also:* It will be convenient to remember here, what he is proving, least his Argument should be sick of an old Disease which some call *Ignoratio Elenchi*. And that was, That God did not design, by choosing Abrahams Posterity, to exclude the rest of the world from all possible means of Salvation, much less from his Care and Providence: And we will readily own, that all that the Apostle had been excluding from Justification and Salvation, was only an importunate Thing, which has ever given the world trouble in this matter, call'd *Boasting*: So that, shut out but that, and take in what you will or can; God is resolv'd to justify none, Jew or Gentile, but

in

In such a way as shall solidly ascribe all the *Glory to Himself*. So that our Author may sleep on both ears in this matter. The Gentiles were never excluded all possibility of *Salvation*, if they excluded not themselves by *Neglecting* that *Justification by Faith* which he had proclaimed; for so saith the Apostle, v. 30. *It is one God which shall justify the Circumcision by Faith, and the Uncircumcision through Faith*. There is one God alwayes the same, and one Faith ever uniform; and what need had our Author then to fancy, That *Enoch* and *Noah* were justifi'd one way, *Abraham* another, and *Believers* since the coming of *Christ*, a third way: For the same Apostle, *Hebr. 4. 2.* proves that the Gospel was preached to the Jews from of Old, as well as unto others, since his Appearing in the flesh; the same Gospel, For unto us was the Gospel preached as well as unto them; and he proves also that the same Gospel was also preached to *Abraham*, that was preached to the Jews; *Galat. 3. 8.* The Scripture foreseeing that God would justify the Heathen through Faith, preached before the Gospel unto *Abraham*; To *Abraham* in the state of *Uncircumcision*, and therefore under the Notion of a *Gentile*, and not a *Circumcised Jew*. But I would not hinder our Author from making the very best improvement he can of the Text. Which Argument (saith he) (if it have any force in it) must prove Gods respect to the Gentiles before the preaching of the Gospel, as well as since; because it is founded on that Natural Relation God owns to all Mankind, as their mercifull Creator and Governour. If it have any force in it! why do you Question that? He speaks of *St. Paul's* way of Arguing sometimes,

as if a man might draw *Curtis*, whether it should have any strength in it or no; or as if it were an even lay, one way or t'other: No but that [*If*] is not *dubitanus*, but *arguentis*, *If it have*, as undoubtedly it hath; what then? *Why it must prove*: *Muß!* There's the singular *Happiness* of the Man; who is one of *Pauls* familiar *Acquaintances*, and privy to all the *Cryptick* wayes of his *Argumentation*: but what must it prove? why that *before the preaching of the Gospel God had respect to the Gentiles as well as since*: Have a little *Patience*. 1. I would fain know when that time was *before the preaching of the Gospel*; for we have heard that the Gospel was preached to *Abraham*, to the *Jews* in the *Wilderness*, and I think that was Gospel too that was preached to *Adam*, That the seed of the *Woman* should bruise the *Serpents* head. Indeed there was a time when the Gospel was more clearly, publicly and eminently preached, call'd therefore *ἡ εποχή*, the times of the Gospel; but I do not know of any, of which it could be said simply and absolutely the Gospel was not preached. 2. I would very gladly learn also what that respect was, God had for the Gentiles: A respect there might be upon *Common Accounts*; he was their mercifull *Creator* and *Governour*, but that respect is short of what our Author designs: And he might have a respect for the future; there being good *Evidences* of Gods intentions to bring in the *Gentiles* more universally to the knowledge of the Gospel and *Salvation* by *Christ*, when *time* should serve. 3. It would be cleared, what he means by, *as well as since*; *æque*, but not *equaliter*, sure: not so much as since, but as truly and really as since. But because his Reason

is to be
to it wit
Natura
I answer
tiles, so
of Sale
lation,
luntary
joyns iss
But I sh
upon
you, e
out th
the fo
in the
out of
onely
by w
takes
29th
evinc
work
justifi
fore
Tha
in th
in C
ch
I
cum
Ge
Ch
pr
pn

is to be the *Measure* of his Assertion, let us attend to it with diligence; *This Respect is founded on that Natural Relation God owns to Mankind*: To which I answer, Whatever respect God had to the *Gentiles*, so as to afford them at any time the *Means of Salvation*, it was not founded on *Natural Relation*, as their *Creator*; but on a *Relation Voluntary*, and of *pure and mere Grace*; and we will join issue with him upon this point when he pleases. But I shall endeavour to set the Apostles Argument upon its own Legs: What he drove at, he shews you, v. 28. *That a Man is justifi'd by Faith, without the deeds of the Law*: he had proved this in the foregoing Verse, thus: *The way that God takes in the Justifying of a Person, is such a one as shuts out of doors Boasting*; But *Justification by Faith*, onely excludes *Boasting*, and the way of *Justifying by works* would not exclude it, and therefore God takes that way to justify the Sons of Men: In this 29th verse, he proceeds to another Argument to evince the same Thing. If *Justification come by the works of the Law*, then never any *Gentile* could be justifi'd, but *some Gentiles* have been justifi'd, Therefore *Justification comes not by the works of the Law*. That *some Gentiles* had been justified, he proves in the Instance of *Abraham*, who was justifi'd, not in *Circumcision*, but in *Uncircumcision*, as he says, ch. 4. v. 10.

Now it's evident, that *Circumcision* and *Uncircumcision* are *Terms of equal wideness* with *Jew* and *Gentile*: For that which he calls v. 29. of the third Chapter, *Jew* and *Gentile*; Verse the 30th he expresses by *Circumcision* and *Uncircumcision*: It is one God that shall justify the *Circumcision* (the Jews)

by

by Faith, and the Uncircumcision (the Gentiles) through Faith; and this he brings as a proof of his foregoing Assertion, Seeing it is one God, &c. And therefore Abraham, though he were an Hebrew by Birth (whether so denominated as coming from the Race of Heber, or from his passing over Euphrates, as some will have it, it makes no matter,) yet being uncircumcised, he fills the room (in Gods account) of a Gentile, or one of the Nations. Now for the proof of the sequel of the first Proposition; That if Justification comes by the works of the Law, then never any Gentile could be justified: he takes special care to put that out of Question, v. 30. Seeing it is one God that justifies. There is but one God that justifies, and therefore but one way of Justification; as he is alwayes the same, so is his Method alwayes the same; One God, one Christ, one Faith; and therefore if ever any Gentile were justifi'd without the works of the Law, never any Jew could be justifi'd by it; for that would be to suppose two wayes of justifying sinners (and such were Jews and Gentiles, both under sin, both guilty before God,) and then that would prove, that God were not the same one God, which the Apostle throws out of doores. Let our Author now cast up his Accounts, and see what he has gain'd by this place; God is the God of the Gentiles: Such a God as has justified Gentiles, [vñ dñya.] for instance, Abraham; and that as his God in a Covenant of Grace, I will be thy God; and therefore it follows, that Jews are not, were not, could not be justified by the works of the Law; and then no such thing will be inferred, that God as a Creator had such a respect to every Individual Person in the World, being fallen sinners,

to give them the *Means of Salvation*: But to proceed.

This plainly evinces (saith he) that all those particular favours which God bestowed on Israel, were not owing to any partial fondness, and respect to that People. Methinks I hear our Author speak like the Great Pompey, when he had got *Cesar* into *Lobs-pound*. *Non recusare se quin nullius usus Imperator existimaretur, si sine maximo detrimento, Legiones Caesaris sese recepissent inde, quo temerè essent progressa.* De Bell. Civ. lib. 3. Let our Author never be reputed a *Man at Arms* more, if he has not got us into such a *Cramp* and *Purse-nett*, that we shall never escape without loss of *Bag* and *Baggage*: For thus he assaults us. Had God a *Partial Fondness* and respect for Israel? Answer Yea or No. I see we are quite undone: If we say No, he has us on the *Hip*, and comes over us with a *Why not?* what, no respect for Israel? no favour for his Beloved People? Why *Psalm 147. 20.* *He has not dealt so with any Nation; he shew'd his Word unto Jacob, his Statutes and his Judgements unto Israel:* and where are we now? If we say, Yes: Then he fetches us over the *Coles*; What, partial fondness in God! one Law for *Titius*, another for *Sempronius*? *Fish of one, and Flesh of another?* I see we must fall upon one of the *horns* of this *Dilemma*, and both are equally mortal: And never was there more need of the good *Curat's Collect*, to be deliver'd from the great Pain and Peril of *Cow-goring*: We have got a *Wolf by the Ears*, and dare neither keep, nor slip our hold for our own. When I read this and some other like passages in his Book, surely thought I, this man takes us all for *Widgeons* and

and Woodcocks, and that to Scribble with him, is nothing but the Recreation of catching Dottrals, could never else hope to Impose upon us with so Childish, and obvious a Sophism. In short, 'tis nothing but *Fallacia plurium interrogationum*: As you should ask our Author, Whether he were at London with a Feather in's Cap? He would not scruple to answer, He is indeed at London, in the Parish of St. George, but he has no Feather in's Cap: Well, Good for one, good for another. God had a respect for Israel, but no partial Fondness. Two things then would be a little cleared, that God had, and upon what account he had a particular respect to Israel.

[1.] God had a special respect to Israel above all the People in the World, Rom. 3. 1. *What advantage then hath the Jew? and what profit is there of Circumcision? Much every way!* *Πλεονεκτημα πολλά τῷ Ἰσραήλ.* Upon all accounts they carried it; But chiefly, that unto them were committed the Oracles of God. Rom. 9. 4. *To whom pertaineth, the Adoption, and the Glory, and the Covenants, and the giving of the Law, and the Services of God, and the Promises, whose are the Fathers, and of whom, as concerning the Flesh, Christ came:* As whereas God chose Abrahams Posterity, and committed His Laws to them, from whence (as our Author thinks) all the rest of the World might when they please fetch the Rules of Good Life, this very thing argues a particular respect, otherwise God might have made them fetch the Rules of Good Life from others: He might have made them the Borrowers, and others the Lenders; some respect above others, God then had undoubtedly for them.

[2.] Upon

[2.]
cular r
Author
Fondne
that he
sons.
barsh
unplea
to the
Place
Parti
due to
be de
has n
I ma
Intw
the o
the c
any
form
coul
deni
Deb
they
they
the
new
ous
Pr
ne
fec
lon
the
no

[2.] Upon *what* account, had God this particular *respect* for them? And here we agree with our Author in the Negative; It was not out of *partial Fondness*: We would deliver him from *that* fear, that he may *sleep* the better, and that for these Reasons. 1. *Partiality* and *Fondness* are words of a harsh sound, they grate upon our Ears with such unpleasantness, that they can be no ways ascribed to the Glorious God: For God stands not in *that* Place, or Relation to his Creatures that he can be *Partial*: In matters of mere Grace and Favour, due to neither (and therefore without Injustice may be denied to either or both as we please) Partiality has no place. If two Persons be equally worthy, I may give that to one which I will not to the other; In two Persons justly condemned, the pardoning of the one is no Impeachment of Royal Justice, though the other suffer under his Sentence: If God gave any thing more to the Jew than the Gentile; The former could not boast, it was Grace; the latter could not murmur, they had no wrong. If God denied the Gentiles his Gospel, He was not their Debtor; they owed him more for their Beings than they could ever pay, and it might have been expected they should have cleared their old Obligations, before they desired to be Trusted for more, and run into new Arrears. 2. Then it was upon a most glorious Project, that he might secure to the World the Promised Seed, and have him forth-coming in the fullness of time. Hence is it, that when that People seem'd to be at the brink of final Ruine, to be swallowed up of Destruction, Gods great Cordial was the Reminding them of this, That the Messiah was not yet come, but he must assuredly come; and therefore

fore

fore no possibility of *Internection*, and utter *Extirpation* of that Nation, *Root and Branch*; to which Design of God had they attended by Faith, they had Lived more *above slavish fears* than they did, *Isa. 7. 1, 2.* VVhen *Rezin King of Syria*, and *Pekab King of Israel* were in *Confederacy* against *Judah*; the News discomposed them, *The Heart of Ahaz was moved as the Trees of the Wood are moved with the Wind*; and what way Does the Lord take to calm his *Tumultuating Spirit*? *ver. 14. A Virgin shall Conceive and Bear a Son, and shall call his Name Immanuel.* VVhy but may not we be all Dead and Rotten by that time? No, if Christ must come of the Tribe of *Judah*, of the Family of *David*: That Tribe, that Family cannot perish, till they have served Gods Design and Glorious Ends, in handing down a Messiah, and then they shall be thrown into the *Common Box*, and retired to the *Grofs* of the World, under the ordinary Care of Gods general Providence: Till then, they might say with Him: *Fear not, Casarem vehis, & fortunam Casaris*; Christ, and the Concerns of Christ, are all *Ventured in this Bottom*. But our Author I perceive does by no means like this Reason: But *The Design of all was to Encourage the whole World to Worship the God of Israel.* This was a Design indeed, but not the only Design; He himself assures us of that, *p. 28. It was one great and principal Design*: And then we must not strain things too far, for fear they break. Our Author must have it Encouraging the whole World, or *Nothing*; every Nation upon the face of the Earth: But I doubt the sound of the Jewish Deliverances did not reach the whole Creation, and *Habitable World*; we see

Sounded

Sounds grow faint and languish by degrees; and at last Expire: It's evident that the Gentiles had mistaken what they heard of the Jews great Salvations; into their own Stock; and all was involved in Fables; and Superstitions. VVhat they heard of Moses and Mount Sinai, some turn'd into their Babelus; and his Mount Nysa; Sampson was grown Hercules, and Noah became Deucalion; so that Converts to God upon the accounts of the Fame of these things were very rare, one Naaman in an Age or so, perhaps an Urijah, or a few more:

*Totidem tibi sunt Numero, quot
Thebarum Porta, vel divitis Ostia Nili.*

VVhat then our Author Quotes *Psal.* 98. 2. for, I cannot tell, unless to prove that Jesus Christ should come into the VVorld, to the unspeakable Rejoycing; and Reviving of the rational Creature: Of which this *Psal.* is a plain Prophecie: And so is *Psal.* 102. 15. *The Heathen shall fear the Name of the Lord, and all the Kings of the Earth thy Glory: And his Practice upon the place is Visible, turning [shall] into [might] which needs no trouble to discover.* The 96. *Psal.* 4, 5. shews the Excellency of Jacobs God above all the Idols of the Heathen, and all within the Call of this *Psal.*, are Invited to come to Joyn themselves to Gods People and Church, ver. 8. *Bring an Offering, and come into his Courts;* and both this *Psal.*, and the 98th. very evidently have their Completion in the Saviour of the VVorld; both concluding thus, *For he cometh, for he cometh, to Judge the Earth;* Verified in Him whose Title was, *ὁ ἑρχόμενος*, and who affirms

firms of Himself, John 9. 39. *For Judgment am I
 come into the World.* But let us hear more: "As
 "God set up the People of Israel as a visible De-
 "monstration to all the VWorld, of his Power and
 "Providence, so he committed his Laws and Ora-
 "cles to them, from whence the rest of the VWorld,
 "when they pleas d, might fetch the best Rules of
 "Life, and the most certain Notices of the Divine
 "VWill. Fair and softly: 1. *These other Nations*
 are supposed by our Author, to have had already
good Rules of Life; though not the *very best*, and
certain Notices of the Divine Will, though not the
most certain: He tells us p. 29. *God instructed*
them by the Light of Nature; and then, *Quid qua-*
ram foris cum domi, habeam? No need to look out,
 if they had sufficient at Home, they might save
Shoe-leather, and spare their pains. 2. But what
 if these *best Rules of Life* were not so easily fetcht,
 as he imagines? It was a *huge way* for men to Tra-
 vel from the Remotest parts of the Habitable world,
 to Traverse from the Tropicks and beyond, to Je-
 rusalem, and when they came there, had no assur-
 rance they should not come of a *Sleeveless Errand*,
 and lose their Labour, or at best have nothing but
 their Labour for their Pains; For I do not find that
 they were under any Command of God to deliver
 a Copy of the Law to every one that would *Whistle*
 for it, or hold up the finger: It Border'd pretty near
 upon Christs Time, e're the *Pentateuch* was Tran-
 slated into Greek by the *Septuagint*; and *Prology*
 with all his Interest, had enough to do to make the
 thing *Practicable and Feasible*. And besides the
 Jews were so Superstitiously exact in Examining
 every Copy of the Law, so many Ordels and Exa-
 mina-

minations it must *pass* through, before it could *pass* Muster, that I do not think that the rest of the VVorld could, *when they pleas'd, fetch the best Rules of Life*: And yet there may be a cunning Truth in't too: They might fetch it *when they pleas'd*, because they *never pleas'd* to fetch it. But, 3. As the *Noise of the Jews Deliverance*, and Miraculous preservations might reach the *Neighbour Countries*, (though that also with *much* uncertainty, and mixture) so a *general Rumour* also might Ring in their Ears about their Ceremonial, Typical VVorship, their Feasts, Jubilees, Temple, High Priest, which were things that *mada a Noise*, but that the World ever believed they had a *better Law in Stone*, than they had in their *Hearts*; I cannot conceive, though I am loath to make my narrow ones the *Measure* of our Authors *Conceptions*.

(4.) After a tedious Maze in the Labyrinths of former Ages, we are at length safely Conducted to the more happy Times of the Gospel. For, *When long and sad Experience had proved, all those [former] ways Ineffectual to reform the World, at last God sent his Son, &c.* Two things we are here Instructed in: First, Upon what necessity God sent his Son into the World. Secondly, *What was his Employment* when He was come into the World.

And [1] It may seem that the Son of God had never exchanged the Throne, for the Footstool; nor the King of Glory, taken on Him the form of a Servant, nor He that was Rich to a Miracle, have become Poor to a Proverb, without some Cogent Reason, and pressing Necessity; which our Author will just now favour us withal: And here I sorely suspected it would go very hard with him: For

whereas at other times, no necessity of Christ at all could be found; for both *Jews and Gentiles who knew nothing at all of what Christ was to do in Order to their Recovery, did believe God to be Gracious and Merciful to sinners*, pag. 44. And what could they desire more? Yet now when it will better serve the Turn, and subserve the present Occasion, that Christ may be brought into the World with some Pomp and State, there must be an *indispensible necessity of his coming*, for all other means that had been tried, proved *ineffectual*. What our Author supposes, may I hope without offence, admit a modest Examination. Two things are here by our Author supposed: (1) That the means which God had formerly used, proved *ineffectual to Reform the World*. To which I shall Calmly return, 1. That he had done much better to have proved that they were *Designed by God to reform the World*, before he asserted that they were *ineffectual for that end*; For it seems strange that God so Wise to know what Means would reach the end, and to Choose such as would do it, should pitch upon Means that he knew would never reach their Designed ends. 2. If the end of Christs coming into the World was to reform it, upon an Experiment that all other Means proved *ineffectual*: Must not God be forced to Try another Conclusion at least, and once more to Venture upon other means, because even now the World is unreformed? 3. The Means that God then used, (he will confess) were sufficient for that end, Or else how were they Means? And the Means which God now uses proves not *Effectual* to Reform the World, And what have we got by the Bargain? 4. I hope our

Author

Author will be better advised than to talk of *Effectual Means* of Grace; which shall *Infallibly* reach their ends, for that would bear the Face of *Irresistible Grace*. 5. The ways and means which God *now* uses to reform the World, are *Effectual* to reform as far as He in his wise Counsels did Bless them, and so were they *then*: And the ways and means He formerly used for the reforming the World, reacht not every Individual person *then*; nor have they any higher effect *now*. The *Purpose* and *Counsel* of God then are the *true Measure* of the *Success* and *Efficacy* of the *Means of Grace*, before and since the coming of Jesus Christ. (2) He supposes that God had *tried other Means* to reform the World, but upon proof found them *Ineffectual*. A supposition *extremely Scandalous* to those apprehensions which both *Natural Light* and *Scripture*, teach us to entertain of the Blessed and Glorious Majesty.

1. They are *Reproachful*, and *Scandalous* to that which may be known of God by Natural Reason. VWhich, if ever it taught us one Letter of Gods Name, will teach us this: That God must needs fore-know what will be the Issues of things; seeing nothing can be supposed *Contingent* to him, without another Supposition that he is *Ignorant* of what is so *Eventual* and *Contingent* to him. If we know any thing of God, it is that he knows all things; but according to our Authors Notions of things, we have God drest up like an Emperick, that must try his prescriptions upon his patients, before he can tell how they will work: And yet its some comfort, they purchase their Skill only at the peril of mens Lives (which yet are too precious to be so cheaply

prostituted to blind Experiment) but God (who in our Authors Divinity had been practising upon the World for Four thousand years, before he saw his mistake) bought his skill with the Blood of many millions of Souls, who perished under his hands by ineffectual Remedies; and now he must be forced either to study, and find out some more effectual Means, or else give up the World as desperate and irrecoverable; And now, whether his Expressions do not more than squint that way, let the impartial Reader determine.

2. *Scandalous*, even to Blasphemy, to the general Current of *Scripture-Revelation*; which fully and frequently assures us, that God well knew what success his Methods and Wayes of Reformation would have, and what entertainment they would meet with in the World from Sinners, where he pleased not to second and back them with his effectual Power; and yet still he used them as Means to reach his own Ends. *Exod. 3. 19. I am sure the King of Egypt will not let you goe, no not with a strong hand. Exod. 7. 3. I will multiply my Signs, and my wonders in Egypt, but Pharaoh shall not hearken unto you.*

[2] For the *Employment* and *Work* which our Author is pleased to assign unto Christ upon his Coming into the World, he tells us, that was, *To make a full and perfect Declaration of Gods will; to give us the best Rules of Life, and to encourage our Obedience with the most express Promises of a blessed Immortality.* And if this be all the Business our Author has shaped out for him, I shall the less wonder, that he can see no Necessity of Christs Coming into the World; and as little, that others can

can see no Necessity that he should be the Eternal Son of God: But whatever the Matter is, in these and the following lines, I observe our Author falls short of his wonted Accuracy and Confidence: He hesitates and staggers, and goes backwards and forwards, and strangely bewilders himself in Contradictions.

Pag. 30. he tells us, *The secret Purposes of Gods Counsels were conceal'd from Ages;* and yet before he takes off his Pen, he tells us, *The Prophets did not so fully understand them: Understand them then it seems they did; and fully understand them too, but not so fully understand them.* It would tempt one to turn Questionist, and humbly ask; If they were *conceal'd before*, how were they *understood*? And if the Prophets did *understand* them, how were they *conceal'd*? Again, *p. 29.* he had let us know, that *the Israelites had the best Rules of Life;* and yet *p. 30.* *That God sent his Son into the World to give us the best Rules of Life.* Whence we see how easily our Author could have saved him that perilous Journey into this mischievous World. Again *p. 30.* he supposes, That before Christ's coming, the World had *Promises*, and *express Promises* too, of a *blessed Immortality*; though indeed not *so express*: And yet for all that, *p. 34.* That Christ *only* brought to light *Immortality*; which has a greater Truth in't than perhaps our Author is aware of: Again *p. 33.* he acquaints us, That *God was formerly known by the Light of Nature, the Works of Creation and Providence, and occasional Revelations;* and *p. 44.* That *those Natural Notions the Heathens had of God, and the discoveries God made of himself in the works of*

Creation and Providence, did assure them that God is very good, and that it is impossible to understand what Goodness is, without pardoning Grace; and yet p. 33. he would fain perswade us, That NOW, (since Christs coming) The onely true Medium of knowing God, is the Knowledge of Christ, who came to declare God to us. A discovery indeed very surprizing: For if Natural Light, without Christ, could reveal it then, why can it not doe it still? how comes it to pass that Creation and Providence cannot perform the same Office now? If Christ be the onely true Medium now, it would make one suspect he was so then. The Light of Christ has not weakened the Light of Nature, but improved and sublimated it; he came not to be an Extinguisher to the Candle of the Lord, but a Candlestick; not to put out the Eye of Reason, but to provide an Eye-salve for it. Did Creation and Providence, preach God to be a sin-pardoning God then, and are they suspended ab officio, & beneficiis, in the Court-Christian, and become silenc'd Ministers? And yet he seems to Retract this, p. 35. Nor have we any other certain way of knowing this [the secret Purposes of Gods Counsel concerning the Salvation of Mankind] but by the Revelation Christ hath made to us. Other wayes there may be still, if any will run the Risque, and venture upon them, but none so certain as this. And here comes in the fine Expedient for the Salvation of the Terra incognita, without the Revelation of Christ. And yet once again, p. 30. he assigns the work of Christ, coming in the flesh, to be, To make a full and perfect Declaration of Gods Will, and yet by and by, as if he had forgot, or over-shot himself, he confesses,

esses,
in the V
yet be
his Sac
half of
tells us
Exerc
throug
hard-b
distan
When
confide
the wo
parts
shiere
shall p
Ligh
the be
No
his Se
lent h
would
from
ed the
swadin
tions,
14. 6.
man c
was C
of id
a thir
ding
I am
comes

lesses, it was but *One main end of Christs appearing in the World, to reveal God to us*: And so there may yet be some little room left for his Priestly Office, his Sacrifice and Interposition with God, on the behalf of Sinners. And lastly, as I remember, p. 5. he tells us, that *Christs Preaching the Gospel was the Exercise of his Regal Power*, and indeed all along through that Chapter, the *Kingly Office* carried it hard-born from the rest, and ran them sheer out of distance, and yet the wind is vered about, p. 34. *When we speak of the knowledge of Christ, we must consider him as our Prophet*. But really if this be all the work Christ had to doe in the world, Two third parts of Christs Mediatory Employment are cashiered, and the other lyes at mercy, whenever he shall please to revive the Commission of *Natural Light*, to reveal *God's sin-pardoning Mercy*, and the *best Rules of Life* unto the World.

Now that he may give the better countenance to his Sentiments herein, he thought it meet to lay violent hands upon some Texts of Scripture, which else would have frowardly and perversly hung back from abetting his Fancies, and so might have spoyled the Game. A taste of his Excellencies, in perswading or forcing Scripture to warrant his Notions, he will give us in his Learned Gloss upon Job. 14. 6. *I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life, no man cometh unto the Father but by me*. But never was Comment so pestered, so thwack'd with a Lirry of *id est's*, one clambring on the back of another, a third mounted o'th top of that, a fourth bestriding that, a fifth in the neck of that, and so on: *I am the Way, id est, I declare the way. No man comes to the Father but by me; id est, None can* throughly

thoroughly understand the will of God, but by learning of me. Whoever knows me, id est, is acquainted with the Doctrine I preach; Knowes my Father, id est, Is Instructed in Gods Mind and Will. Gods Will, id est, the Gospel. *Cetera desiderantur.*

Now the very truth is, all this is nothing but a trifling Imitation of his old Friend *Volkelius*, de vera Relig. lib. 4. c. 2. p. 173. *Et hoc quidem illud est, quod ipse Christus ait, Joh. 14. 6. Neminem nisi per ipsum ad patrem pervenire, id est, Neminem Dei Patris Cognitionem assequi nisi per Christum posse;* Which shall never be spoyled by my bungling English, our Author having saved me the labour, and clearly translated it to my hands. But is it so indeed? Does *Coming to God* imply and import no more than the bare *knowing of God*? Surely there's some other, some more excellent Act of the Soul denoted by it: God may be known by, and yet the Soul never come to God: The Devils know him, and yet, fly away from him: It supposes indeed the *knowledge of God*; none can come to an unknown God; but yet it further denotes the Souls address to God in Faith and Love by Jesus Christ; for though it were revealed, that God is a sin-pardoning God in himself, yet still the Sinner has need of an *Advocate* with him, even *Jesus Christ the Righteous, who is a Propitiation for its sins*, 1 Joh. 2. 1. In whose Name, and through the Power of whose prevailing Blood, the guilty Creature may come and treat with God about his Pardon and Acceptation. In the next Section we shall find our Author as *ingenuous* and *plain-hearted* as one could almost wish, he opens a *Casement* in his *Breast*, and lets us see how the *pulse of his Soul* beats, freely owns where he bor-

rowed

owed h
For, no
Sheaves
the ver
his Ben
men nif
conspic
taluns
our Au
made
and W
called
yes, w
nion,
For so
G. ch
npose
tam n
thor v
part st
he) (C
he it
the es
Autho
ber h
I c
our
petit
logie
to e
(if o
mer
be N
cash

owed his Divinity; but here I want that Candor,
 for, not content to glean amongst *Volkeliu's* his
 Sheaves, (which an honest man may doe) he steals
 the very Shocks, and never so much as once owns
 his Benefactor. Lib. 3. de verâ Relig. p. 173. *Deum*
nisi per Christum cognosci potest, ut qui Dei in-
conspicui Imago est, 2 Cor. 4. 4. eumque id est ejus
voluntatem nobis enarravit: Now will you have
 our Authors Translation in Masquerade; *Christ hath*
made a True representation of the Divine Nature,
and Will, and it's plain, that in this Sence Christ is
called the Image of God, 2 Cor. 4. 4: It's Plain!
 yes, wondrous plain, that *Volkeliu's* is of that Opi-
 nion, and for any other plainness we are to seek.
 For so he. Ibid. *Quâ de causâ splendor glorie Dei*
et character substantie ejus appellatur, Hebr. 1. 3.
apote clarissimè perfectissimèque Divinam volunta-
tem nobis explanans: But here I perceive our Au-
 thor will compound willingly with him, and fairly
 part stakes with him. Upon which account (sayes
 he) (as well as with respect to his Divine Nature)
 he is call'd, *The Brightness of his Fathers Glory, and*
the express Image of his Person. And when our
 Author has yielded him, *The Maybeso*, we remem-
 ber his Excellency in concluding it *Must be so.*

I confess, I have neither list nor leisure, to follow
 our Author through the tedious Ramble of his Re-
 petitions, because I see he loves no bodies Tauto-
 logies but his own; nor shall I be much concern'd
 to enquire after that odd generation of Men, who
 (if our Author may be believed) clamour most un-
 mercifully, that *Christ is never Preach'd, unless he*
be Named in every Sentence: For I know well it's
 casie to make a Man of Clouts, and then to arraign,
 condemn

condemn, and execute in *Effigie* the Creature of our own Making: Thus did the Barbarous Heathens cloath the Primitive Christians in Bears-skins, and then expose them to be torn in pieces by the Dogs: And thus are Christians dress'd up by the bloody Papists in the *Sambenis*, or Devils-Coat, and then committed as Hereticks to the greater Mercy of the devouring flames. I know it's an easie thing with our Author to Name Christ a hundred times, and yet to speak as very little of Gospel, as he has done. But one thing I must, and desire the Reader, that he will not fail to take special Notice of: I find our Author over the shoes in Love, and most desperately doting upon his own Critical Learning; for having observed to us, *Ch. 1. that ἡδύχρηστος* Eph. 4. 20. signifies *not Taught*, (as our English Translation jejune renders it) *but instructed*, emphatically Instructed: And suspecting least by this time, in a dolt of words, and hurry of Business, we might have quite forgot it, he very charitably rubs up our Memory, and refers us to the place of its Birth, where that happy Criticisme first drew its breath, and appeared in the World. 'Tis Chapter the First, (Reader,) Oh! never forget Chapter the First, Happy Chapter the First, that first seem'd so precious a Notion, for the Benefit of succeeding Ages. Now because these Papers of mine and his are like to be long-lived, and perhaps not to survive the year of their Birth; and yet to be deprived of the Observation, would be a loss Irreparable; let me begg of our Author to send this enclosed Note to Mr. P. which I have left open, that he may have the Honour of Letters Patents.

To

TO THE

*Reverend Author of the Synopsis Criticorum
aliorumque S. S. Interpretum.*

SIR,

BEING a great Admirer of, and a small Sub-
scriber to your learned Labours, I was also
Ambitious to contribute something to their
Intrinsic Value; Be pleased therefore, when
Ephel. 4. 20. shall call for your Industry, to
take special Notice of the late Observation of
Mr. W. S. and instead of Taught, to read
Instructed; and as you will thereby enrich
your Work, and doe right to the Author, so
will you Oblige Posterity, and particularly,

Your humble Servant,

N. N.

Having thus fairly rid my hands of the Encum-
brance of our Author, I might honestly wind up
this Section, did I not think it might be acceptable
to the Reader to receive a Breviate of some of the
True Reasons, why it was Necessary Christ should
come into the world, the main Work he had to do
here, and the special Design of that Work in refe-
rence to God and Man.

(1.) The Causes rendering it Necessary that the
Son of God should once appear in this lower World,
are

are such as these. 1. The first Cause lay deep in the Bosom, Counsel and Decree of God; who before he viewed the Fall and Revolt of Man, from before the world was, so did he purpose effectually to recover again to himself his Elect by Christ: Therefore is God said, 1 *Tis.* 1. 2. to *promise Eternal Life before the World began*; that the Faith of the Elect eyes this Promise, that the Ministers of the Gospel do preach this Promise, all of which are *only Yea and Amen* in Christ. 2. The Compliance of the Son of God in pursuance of this Eternal Purpose, is very considerable, who was *animately sent*, and *voluntarily came*, to speed the Decree and Counsel of God, *Heb.* 10. 7. *Lo I am to do thy Will, O God.* 3. The Early Promise of a Redeemer, almost from the Foundation of the World, made God a Debtor, not to Man, but to his own Truth, to send him in the Fulness of Time into the World, who before all Time was purposed, and in the first dawnings of Time was promised. *Heb.* 10. 7. *is written in the Beginning of the Scripture, in the Head of the Book, it is written, viz. Gen. 3. 15. That the Seed of the Woman should bruise the Serpents head.* 4. The renewed and frequently repeated, and gradually enlarged Promises and Prophecies of a Redeemer, once to be actually exhibited, whereby God keeps alive the drooping Hope, and languishing Faith of his Church, as Candidates in a State of Expectancy, superadded another Cause of the Necessity of Christ coming in the Flesh; *Gen.* 49. 10. *The Scepter shall not depart from Judah, nor a Law-giver from between his feet, till Shiloh come. Isa.* 9. 6. *Unto us a Child is born, unto us a Son is given, and his Name shall be called*

shall be
God, the
5. The
Joining
had all
Him;
the Sub
could
appeal
and the
the Sc
yet th
own N
respec
up to
that t
so long
be far
due C
Case
the b
the C
upon
his C
that
wron
invol
Wife
God
belie
ther
othe
Wo
vere

shall

shall be called *Wonderfull, Counsellor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace.* 5. The Types and Shadowes which from the Beginning represented him to the Faith of Believers, had all their Strength, Vertue, and Efficacy from Him; and that also made it Necessary, that Christ the Substance should come to answer them: for what could the blood of Bulls and Goats signifie to the appeasing of Gods Anger, the removing of Guilt, and the making peace betwixt God and Man, which the Scripture frequently assures us they did doe, and yet the same Scripture as clearly assures us in their own Nature they could not doe, otherwise than with respect to that Sacrifice once for all to be offer'd up to God for that end? 6. And it was Necessary, that the gracious God who had trusted the World so long with Pardon, Peace, and Life, should at last be satisfied, and not alwayes be put off without due Compensation to his Justice and Truth. 7. The Case and Condition of the Elect of God, made by the common Apostacy Enemies to God, and under the Curse annex'd to the Violation of the Law; upon this one Supposition, that God would pursue his Original Love and Purposes of Grace to them, that a due Compensation should be provided for his wronged Justice: Sin had perplexed matters, and involved things in such Intricacies, that Humane Wisdom could not find out an Expedient, How God might be Just, and yet the Justifier of him that believes; how Mercy and Truth should meet together, how Righteousness and Peace should kiss each other: Many Salvo's have been propounded to the World, many Expedients set on foot, but upon severer scrutiny, have been found Physicians of no value,

value, not able to heal the wounds of an inquisitive Conscience, awaken'd with the sense of the Souls worth, and Gods wrath in the Judgement to come: All these things does the Lord Christ alone. compromise, adjust all these Accounts, and reconcile their Interests: The Justice of God is satisfied, the Law fulfilled, the Truth of God secured, his Holiness vindicated, and all his Attributes unapproached: 'Tis true indeed, God is a free Agent, and absolutely consider'd might have left the world to perish under the Curse, but seeing it pleased him to carry on his design of Love still, notwithstanding the intervention of sin; what others may pretend, *I know not*; but to our Apprehensions, as *there is but one God the Father, of whom are all things, and we in him; so, there is one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him,* 2 Cor. 8. 6.

(2.) The *Work of Christ* whilst in the World, was the discharge of his whole *Mediatory Undertaking*, as *Prophet, Priest and King*; To divide Christ, is to destroy him. As half a Heart is no Heart in Gods Acceptation, so half a Christ is no Christ, as to any saving advantage the Soul can possibly reap from him. He was therefore,

1. A *Prophet*, to acquaint us fully with the Preceptive will of God, in which rank we must place that great Command of Faith in Christ, 1 John 3. 23. *And this is his Commandement, that we should believe on the Name of his Son Jesus Christ.* He acquainted us also with the Promissory Will of God, as the great Encouragement of our Souls in walking resolutely with God in wayes of New Obedience; He acquainted us also with the Purposes of God, which should follow his Promises, and Pre-

cepts

cepts to invigorate them with Efficacy and Success: And this he does by the Ministry of his Word, but more especially by the Holy Spirit, inwardly and powerfully, and yet sweetly, not offering violence to our Faculties, but making us a *willing People in the day of his Power.*

2. He was a *Priest*, and as such he offer'd himself a *true and proper Sacrifice* to God, thereby answering the Sacrifices of the Old Testament, which though they were Typical, yet in their way were true and Real Sacrifices, and all this in pursuit of the Fathers Love, and his own. *1 Joh. 4. 10. Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us; and sent his Son to be the Propitiation for our sins;* what Intercessions as a *Priest* he made for those the Father had given him, we need no other pattern of, than that Prayer, *John 17. per totum.*

3. His *Kingly Office*, he exercised in gathering, governing, defending, protecting his Church; abolishing those Laws which were accommodated to that other Dispensation, and would not fit its present posture, and instituting New Ordinances of Worship agreeable to the œconomy of the New Testament: which Office yet he exercised in such a way, that little of Glory and Majesty appeared therein to a Carnal Eye, the Grandeur thereof being veiled under the form of a Servant.

(3.) The *general Design of this Work* we may assure our selves was exceeding Glorious, nothing but admirable could be the Product of such an undertaking; with what Joy and Triumph was it entertain'd by the Angels, who were less concern'd therein than poor fallen Man. *Luke 2. Glory be to God on high, on Earth peace, good will towards men.*

K

1 Tim.

1 Tim. 1. 15. *This is a faithfull saying, and worthy of all acceptation, that Iesus Christ came into the World to save sinners; the chiefest of Sinners: Which Great End that he might attain, he dealt with God as a Priest, to reconcile him to us; with Us he dealt as a Prophet, enlightning our Minds in the Knowledge of God, and our selves; and as a King subduing our hearts by his Spirit of Grace, to accept of those Terms which might secure the Glory of God, in our Eternal Salvation. But the main Design I shall express no otherwise than in the words of the Church of England, Art. 2.---who suffered, and was crucified, dead and buried, to reconcile his Father to us, and to be a Sacrifice, not only for Original, but all Actual sins of Men. From whence we learn,*

1. That *Reconciling and Sacrificing Work* is only proper for a state of Humiliation; it's annex'd to his Death, Sufferings, Sacrifice.

2. That the *Death of Christ* (according to the mind of this Article) supposes God to be incens'd against, and angry with Sinners, and therefore he suffered to Reconcile God to us.

3. That the *Death and Sufferings of Christ* are of *sufficient value* to secure Gods Honour, and appease his Anger.

4. That *Original Sin*, how small a mote soever it may seem in some mens eyes, is yet such a troublesome Beam in Gods eyes, that it requires the same Blood of Christ to be a Sacrifice for it.

5. That all *Actual sins* (even the *smallest*, if any may be called *small*) need the Blood of Christ to reconcile God to the Sinner, without which they will infallibly destroy the Soule. Thus far the Church
of

of England; of whose Doctrine our Author has great Reason to be very tender, if not for the Truths sake, yet for his Credits sake, having subscribed it; and above all for St. Georges sake *Burtholms-lane*; for otherwise it may be easie for some poching, prolling, Fellows, to dismount *George-a-horse-back*, and get into our Authors Saddle;

CHAP. III. Sect. 2.

Of Acquaintance with the Person of Christ.

Interest is beholden to the *Eagle* for two of its greatest Excellencies, a quick Eye to discover, and sharp Pounces to seize the Quarry. When once it had appeared in some pregnant Instances, that the High road to Preferment lay in the way of exposing Religion under the Persons of the Non-Conformists, it's incredible how soon sagacious Interest discern'd, and made her advantage; The old dull Methods of Marrying the Chamber-maid, or Tricking with the young Gentleman, grew as Obsolete as Systematical Divinity; An unhappy happy Wit or two, had successfully managed the grand Project of Self-Advancement by these Artifices, and this new and blessed mode of Simony had Wealth and Honour came Trolling in amain, and then Interest, which ever spies peep of day at a Narrow Cranny, soon struck into the practice of it: But

there was a *small inconvenience* which attended the Design, and may possibly (if not timously prevented) spoil its Expectations: For when every *Peddling* wit would be pecking at the Trade; the *Commodity* stuck most miserably upon their hands, became a *very Drug*; and even *scuffling at Religion* turn'd to as little Account, as the more common and trite way of Whipping and Spurring for the first Occupancy of a Presentation. It's usually, and easily observed, that the first Authors of great Inventions commonly grow Rich by their Novel Discoveries; but when *ordinary Abilities* will be tampering and dabling with what they want Brains to manage, they fall wondrously short of their wide Hopes, and hugeous Expectancies: And just so has it proved in the Case before us. They who first taught this too docile Age to *Travestee* serious matters, had indeed the *Vogue*, and engross'd the Benefit of their Inventions to their own proper Use and Beboof; but Pretenders soon elapt in (as you know if one Dog has a Bone, all the rest will be about his Ears) and now the multitude of Candidates has so brought down the Market, that it will quit for Cost little better than the plain *Dunstable* high-way of Favour, Alliance, and Bribery. The best Advice therefore I shall ever be capable of giving our Author and his Co-partners in this Trade, will be; That they improve their Friends to procure a *special Priviledge*, or *golden Bull* from his Holiness, That none presume to Preach, Print, or otherwise to publish any *Invectives*, *Sarcasms*, *Satyrs*, *Drollery*, or *Raillery* whatsoever, whether with Wit, or without Wit, against J. O. T. J. W. B. and the rest of the Non-conformists, nor against the Christian Religion under

der their Names, during the space of One and Twenty Years, now next and immediately ensuing the date hereof, without the special Leave, and express Licence of them the said S. P. and W. S. or their Assigns.

Some I perceive who are less knowing in this Mystery, have given themselves causeless trouble to enquire, Why our Author should single out *these Persons and their Writings* for his Enemies, when he might with the same Ease and Modesty have combated the *first Reformers of our Church*, reproached the *Reverend Bishops*, and most eminent *Divines*; and above all, duelled the *Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England*; and either with *Franciscus à S. Clara*, have reconciled them to his own Notions, or if they were stomachfull and stubborn, and would not bend, most stoutly have *confuted them*: But these Persons do not consider, that such a Procedure had been both *Dangerous and Scandalous*; *Dangerous*, because that Doctrine is *Armed with Law*, and fenced with *Secular Power*; and *Scandalous*, because it would have looked with an *ugly face*, first to *subscribe* them, to *gratifie* a mans *Convenience*, and then to *confute* them to *satisfie* his *Conscience*: And therefore this other way was judged *more eligible*, which might *secure*, if not *reward* the *Author*, and yet *as effectually* destroy the *Doctrine*: That he fixt upon this Course therefore as more *adviseable*, never created my wonder, but *one thing* I confess did; That the *Governours of the Church* should appear so *tender* in a *Ceremony*, and yet seem so *little concern'd* for the *Substance* of the *established Religion*; that they should so *severely Animadvert* upon them who *meddle with a Pin*; and

yet take so little notice of those who are digging up the Foundation of the Building. But hence we may learn, That some may with more safety steal a Horse, than others look over the Hedge; so strangely does the same thing vary from its self, when done by differing hands, that as one informs us, from Livy, Papyrius slighted the Pullarii handsomely, and was well rewarded; when Appius Pulcher for doing the same thing slovenly and rudely, was disgraced.

But it's high time to consider our Author. There are Two Preliminaries which usher in the Body of his Discourse in this Section. First, an Account what notable Feats he has done in the former; and Secondly, a modest account of his own Ingenuity in this Section: What he has achieved in the former, he summes up in few words. After this plain Account, wherein the Knowledge of Christ consists, the summe of which is this, that to understand Christ, is to understand his Gospel; which contains all those Revelations he made of Gods Will. I must needs say, I could have been content he had called it a learned Account, an unparallel'd Account, a witty, genteel, or indeed almost any other Account in the world besides a Plain one; for though there be but little of Truth, yet there's nothing at all of Plainness in it: I had alwayes thought, (and Thoughts are as free for me as another) that the Formale of the Knowledge of Christ lay in knowing his Person, that he is God and Man, two Natures united in one Person; his Offices, that he is our Prophet, our King, our High-Priest; and that the understanding of the Gospel, is the only proper Means to come to the understanding and knowledge of Christ, Who he is,

What

What he is, in Himself, and to us ; But that the knowledge of Christ should consist in understanding the Gospel, is an uncouth way of Prædication where-with I am not yet acquainted. Jesus Christ is understood in and by the Gospel : True ; he that understands the Gospel, must needs understand Jesus Christ : Very good ; but still as a Means leading to that End, and not the very thing it self : Much less is it true, That the Knowledge of Christ consists in understanding the Gospel, as it contains all the Revelations of Gods Will. For this was but a part, and the least part too of Christs Employment and Undertaking ; Christ had something more to doe than revealing to us Gods Will : Suffering the Displeasure, was a harder task than Revealing the Will of God ; It was one thing to Preach a Sermon, and another to sweat drops of Blood ; to have his Soul made an Offering for sin ; to have the Iniquities of us all to meet upon him : Christ had many things to doe, and command as our Lord and Governour ; many things to suffer as our Sacrifice, many to offer as our Priest ; and what he had thus done, and suffer'd, to Reveal to us as our Prophet and Teacher. But supposing all this to be true, That the knowledge of Christ consists in the knowledge of the Gospel ; and suppose also further, that the Gospel contains no more than a Revelation of Gods Will, concerning us and our Obedience ; what use can he make of it ? Why hence he will take a happy occasion to reproach some body or other, who have formed Another Notion of the Knowledge of Christ, very distinct from this, which contains a greater secret than one would at first imagine, and that is, an Acquaintance with Christs Person, which, if we will believe some men, is the

only Fountain of saving Knowledge: And is it grown such an unpardonable Crime in England to be acquainted with, or to have any Knowledge of Christ's Person by his Gospel? Are these things grown so inconsistent all oth' sudden? It's not so very long since, that our Author could allow, that the Greatness of his Person as *Davidson*. God-man, was of some Consideration, and that Consideration of some good use too; we were told what Credit his Person gave to his Laws, what repute it brought to his Doctrine, what value it procured to his Sacrifice, and what Influence it had upon the great Ends of Religion; and are his Person and Gospel so fallen out of late, that there's no hopes of an Accommodation? What our Author may doe, I know not; but other men I am sure, have learn'd to distinguish betwixt a King and his Laws, though they do not oppose them; and to put a difference between a Prophet, and his Revelations, without creating differences between them; they can look upon a Priest and his Sacrifice as two things, and yet not as contrary things; to consider Christ and his Gospel under distinct, and yet not under inconsistent Notions. Oh! but the Quarrel lyes a great deal deeper; That they make the Person of Christ the only Fountain of saving Knowledge: I confess, I could not expect that they should scape without a Chiding, who say, *Christ's Person is the Fountain of saving Knowledge*, when the Apostle himself could not escape a Nip for calling him the only Foundation, p. 105. And yet as it has been accounted discretion not to throw away our foul Water till we have got fair; so some I perceive are resolv'd not to leave their Confidence in Christ till our Author

can

can show them a stronger bottom for Faith, nor to despise Christ as the Fountain of Knowledge, till he has discovered them one both fuller and freer of that which concerns their Salvation: They will own the Gospel to be the Conduit which Conveys to us the Knowledge of God, but they are somewhat bold to assert Christ to be the Fountain that fills it: They own the Gospel to be the next immediate Cause which Derives saving Knowledge to us, but yet Christ is the Original Spring whence all true saving Knowledge of God is Derived; and they are the more confirmed in it, because Christ himself spoke a word, John 1. 18. *That no man had seen God at any time, the only Begotten Son who was in the Bosom of the Father, He hath revealed Him.*

But yet say what you will or can, *There is another Notion of the Knowledge of Christ very distinct from our Authors: The true meaning whereof is no more than this; That it's better so Excellent a Book had been Written upon a false Ground, than none at all, and that it's more desirable to run upon a sleeveless Errand than to sit still.*

And this is enough to stay any mans Stomach by way of Repetition; what gallant Feats our Author has done in the former Section: A Taste of his Modesty, and Ingenuity follows: For, he will not envy the Author the glory of the Discovery, and will therefore honestly confess where he had it: For he who would be loath that any should Rob him of the glory of his rare Discoveries upon Ephes. 4. 20. is as unwilling to be accounted a pilfering Plagiary, one that Filches his Notions from others, and will not own his Benefactors.

Now

Now the great Grievance lies against a Book, *Intitled, Communion with God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost distinctly, Written by John Owen, D. D.* And here I must openly profess, that I have no Commission either from *this Gentleman*, or those others Concern'd in the Reproaches of our Author, to Vindicate their Names, or Interpose in their Concerns, they need not my Defence and Vindication; they are of Age to answer for themselves: and would certainly do it, but that they are Discouraged by an Old French Diverb: *Le jeune vaux pas La chandelle.* The Game will not pay for the Candle. And perhaps they may be of his Temper, who could not be perswaded to wrest that dull Creature that is sometimes free of his Hoof. What I therefore write is by vertue of a general Warrant: In a Common Invasion, every one is supposed to be *Engaged* against the Common Enemy; and a charitable Barker will not be refused towards the Quenching of a general Fire. Every Christian has his Concerns in Truth; and if it be lawful to Oppose it, it may be presumed lawful too to Defend it: Not waiting therefore till I receive express Order, nor fearing the Fate of that noble Person who was Sentenced to Death by his own Father, because he Fought (though he Routed) the Enemy without Command; I shall Impartially consider what his loud Clamour against these Persons signifies, and whether the Fleece do answer the Cry of his Hog-shearing.

Our Author begins with Doctor Owen, and from amongst all the Books that he has Publisht, he has singled out that *Practical piece of Communion with God*: This some think was most absurd, and

disingenuously done, to wave his *Polimical* writings, wherein he has of *set purpose* Stated and Handled these very Points, and fall Foul upon a *Practical* one which meant him no Harm. But they that so Judge, must Excuse me if I think otherwise, and that it was most *Politickly* and *Advisedly* done, for surely might he think, if ever I take the Doctor Napping, and Trip up his Heels, it must be where he never Dreamt of an Enemy. And yet so unluckily has it fallen out, that as if he had been aware of After-claps, and written his Book by *Prophecie*; he has so warily Expressd himself, that none need fear to be his *Second*, or despair of his Faire, and clear Vindication.

His first and great Quarrel is against these words. Commun. p. 88. *Christ is not only the Wisdom of God, but made Wisdom to us, not only by Teaching us Wisdom, as He is the Great Prophet of the Church; but also because by the Knowledge of Him, we become Acquainted with the Wisdom of God, which is our Wisdom: The summe of which is asserted in Terms, Col. 2. 3. In Him dwelt all the Treasures of Wisdom and Knowledge.* The Reader is bound to presume that some great *Mischief* must needs *Lurk* in these words, if one could find it out, though as to us poor Dim-lighted Mortals, there's nothing but what might have Travelled safely upon the Road, without a *Hue and Cry*, and raising the *Posse Comitatus* against it. That *Christ is the Wisdom of God*, and *made Wisdom to us*, is the express Language of the Apostle, 1 Cor. 1. 24. 30. That *He Teaches us Wisdom*, carries the same Scripture Credentials along with it. That *He is the great Prophet of the Church*, is Voucht by the same *Authority*,

thority, that by our knowing of Him, we become acquainted with the Wisdom of God: Any man living might have said, but this Doctor Owen, and a very few more, and have thought no great Harm neither; What ails then our Author thus distally to Paratragedize? whence comes all this Clutter and Din? Had Medea Torn her Children piece-meal, and scattered their reeking Entrails, and bleeding Limbs about the fields? Or had our Author been Invited to Thyestes his Banquet, at the Honour whereof the amazed Sun muffled his face in Clouds? Or had he perhaps (at least in a Play,) seen Hippolytus drawn in Pieces with his own Coach-Horses? Or Hercules stark Raging Mad, with the Centaures poisoned Jerkin? No, not a Syllable of all this: But one Doctor Owen had unadvisedly Quoted, Col. 2. 3. In Him are hid all the Treasures of Wisdom, and Knowledge, to prove that Christ is our Wisdom, &c. All this while the Honest Reader stands wondering what should be the Cause of this high Ferment, and where the Lye should be, that deserves this Stab. But I shall satisfie him: The Doctor thinks these words are true of the Person of Christ; and our Author will needs have them applied to the Doctrine of Christ: The Text (says he) speaks of the Doctrines, and Revelations of Christ. Shall it then be Compounded by indifferent Arbitrators? If our Author will not exclude Christ's Person, I dare undertake the Doctor shall not exclude his Revelations: and so the Controversie shall be all Husht, and Quiet. Two things I shall modestly offer to the Reader. (1.) That in this Text, the Person of Christ must necessarily be Included. And I shall assign these two Reasons.

Reason

Reason 1. It's dangerous to Interpret Scripture at this Rate, as may destroy the Design of it: and if this Course be taken, I know nothing but that the Person of Christ may be Distinguished, and Interpreted out of the whole Bible: If it stand not here necessarily, it stands in all other places but *provariously*; and when he sees good, can show us a way how a *Doctrine* or a *Revelation*, may be *Born* of the *Virgin Mary*, and *suffer* also under *Pontius Pilate*.

Reason 2. The second Verse leads us plainly to a Person; *The Mystery of God, and of the Father, and of Christ*. Hence I am apt to believe, That since the *Father*, and the *Son*, are equally *Con- sider'd* in the *Argument*, are *joyn'd* together in one *Sentence*, are *linckt* in one even *Tenour*, and *Cur- rent* of *Discourse*; if the *Father* signifie a *Litteral* proper *Father*, the *Son* also will prove a *Litteral* and *proper* *Son*. And if the *Son* must be a *Figurative*, *Tropical* *Son*, the *Father* likewise in the *Issue*, will be a *Figurative* and *Tropical* *Father*; either let both be *Real*, or both *Figurative*, since the *Apo- stle* has given us no *Reason* to think otherwise of the one than of the other.

Reason 3. How harsh would it sound in our Ears, to say that *God is the Father of a Doctrine*, an *Office*, and whatever else our *Author* pleases; and yet it's plain, that of that *Son* to whom *God* is a *Father*, the *Apostle* affirms; *In Him are hid all the Treasures of Wisdom and Knowledge*.

Reason 4. It's not conceivable how all the ful- ness of *Wisdom and Knowledge* can dwell in *Christ's Doctrines*, and *Revelations*, without first concei- ving them to dwell in his Person. Commonly,
mens

more *Wisdom* and not fuller of *Wisdom* than the *Head*, whereas therefore our Author would infer, that our *Heart* is not so by *understand of his Person*, because it is *so* of the *Doctrine*, it should then conclude it *so* of the *Doctrine*, because it is *so* of His *Person*, and most absolutely *so* of His *Person*, it were strange way of arguing, that the *Fountain* cannot possibly be full, because the *Vessel* is full, when it is therefore true, that the *Vessel* is full in an *unlimited Capacity*, because the *Fountain* is full without such limitation. *The Vessel is full*.

Reason 5. The whole Current of the Chapter empties it self into a Person. That Person or Thing, (be it who, or what it will) in which, or in whom the Treasures of Wisdom and Knowledge are said to be hid; ver. 2. Is the same, in which, or in whom, ver. 9. All the fulness of the Godhead dwells bodily. Who, or which, ver. 10. Is the Head of all Principalities and Powers; in which, or in whom they were Circumscribed. Who, or which, ver. 12. Was raised from the Dead, to whose Cross, ver. 14. The Hand-writing of Ordinances was Nailed. And who, or which, ver. 15. Spoiled Principalities and Powers, triumphing over them in it.

Reason 6. Because our Author sometimes, when his Ingenuity works, can be content to divide the Matter. Thus, pag. 32. Christ (says he) is called; Heb. 1. 2. the Brightness of his Fathers Glory, and express Image of his Person; as the Will of God was fully declared to the World by Him, as well as with respect to his Divine Nature. And pray why may we not be allowed the same Liberty here to say: All the Treasures of Wisdom and Knowledge are hid in Christ, as well with respect to his Person

to his Doctrine. (1) If this will not do, I have one thing more to acquaint him with: Let him leave that *Imperious way of perpetual Dictatorship*, and fall to Proving, and Arguing, as hard as he can, for it's past that time of day with the World that has its Eyes open, to receive *Confident assertions*; for *Demonstrations*.

Before I dismiss this Period, I must a little further Examine our Authors *Connexions*, and *Dependencies* of things, and the rather because they seem to hang together with no better Friendship, than so many *Pebbles in a Halter*, nor to maintain a stronger Correspondency each with other, than the parts of a *Thumb-rope made of Sand*.

And, 1. He tells us, *That he may not do the Doctor wrong, he must tell us what he means by acquaintance with Christs Person*: And then Quotes the words which we have just now discharged from our Consideration: But say I, this could not be, that he might *not wrong him*, but the contrary, that he might be sure *not to do him right*. For (not to insist upon so small a Matter; that he Mutilates and Mangles the Doctors words) it's very plain that the Doctor does not there describe our *Acquaintance with Christs Person*, but the Effect of it: *That in a Crucified Christ, we behold the Glory of God*, pag. 78.

2. I cannot but observe, what a Mad and Frantick Inference, he draws from the Doctors words: So that our acquaintance with Christs Person, signifies in this mans Divinity: such a Knowledge of what Christ is, hath Done and Suffered for us, from whence we may learn those Greater, Deeper, and more saving Mysteries of the Gospel, which Christ hath

hath not expressly revealed to us. Now this is sure an excellent Invention, and whereof our Author deserves the Patent, to Slander, Revile, and Calumniate a Person, that he may not do him wrong; to Cut a mans Throat, for fear you should hurt him; to Pick his Pocket out of mere tenderness of Conscience, lest you should do him an Injury. Our acquaintance with Christs Person, teaches us no new Doctrine, but only acquaints us with the Reason of the Old ones: We learn from the Gospel that God pardons Iniquity, Transgression, and Sin, and from the same Gospel we understand what Influence the Personal Sufferings of Christ have upon our forgiveness with God. We learn from the Scriptures, That God heareth the Prayers of his People offered in the Name of Christ: And from the same Gospel we learn what the Intercession of Christ as the right Hand of the Father, does contribute to the answer of our prayers. The Person of Christ reveals many other, much less greater, and deeper Mysteries than are revealed in the Gospel; only that upon the account of Christs Person, his Offices, his Undertaking, we have a satisfactory account, how those things which the Gospel reveals, should be Possible and Feasible. Thus Rom. 3. 26. we find that God is the Justifier of him that believes: And Faith that Resolves all its acts into the Veracity and Authority of the Revealer, is ready to assent to, and acquiesce in that Revelation: But suppose God will gratifie the Inquisitiveness of our Spirits, and clear up Matters to the satisfaction of our Trembling, because guilty Souls; the Gospel reveals all this to be in Christ: He is set forth to be a Propitiation through Faith in his Blood, Rom. 3. 25. In him is the Righteousness

ness of God declared: Upon His account God appears to be Just, even then when He is the most Gracious, free, and sovereign Justifier of a Sinner. If then at any time our Faith shall stagger, how the Blood of Christ could be a Propitiation *iniquitatis*, a Pacification with God for us; we are presently Relieved from the Consideration of that Person whose Blood it was, viz. The Blood of Him that is God, Acts 20. 28. and therefore of infinite Value. But because this will hardly pass when we tender it in Payment, we have one to be our Voucher, whose Word will go further than the Doctors Bond, and it is our Authors own dear self. Pag. 19. This assures us of the Infinite value of Christs Sacrifice; God cannot but be well pleased, when his Son undertakes to be a Ransome. The clear and full account therefore of the deep Mysteries, and great Difficulties in our Religion, are to be Salved from a due Consideration of the Person, Natures, Offices, Undertaking, Active and Passive Obedience of Christ; but the Revelations of all these things are Wholly, Only, and Entirely due to the Gospel. There is one thing which I shall touch upon by the way: That for any Doctrine, or Proposition which his Adversaries do Abett, he exacts Rigorously, and they are bound to produce express Revelations, Scripture to a Letter, a Title; but for any of his own phancies, A feeble Conjecture, some far-fetched Consequence shall serve the turn well enough; Such Laws did his Master *Volkelius*, Lib. 3. de vera Relig. Cap. 11. p. 62, once Impose upon the world: That whosoever should bring a Text to prove, that the Church of Old, had the Promises of Eternal Life, must bring one that did assert it; *Apertis Lu-*

culentissimisq; verbis: In plain express Terms. Ay, no doubt, it must be written with a *Sun-beam*, that will enlighten their minds who have *no mind to see*; but if it be drawn with a *Charcoal*, it will do, when its pressed to serve *their Hypothesis*. Now though I much Question whether we be Obligated to abide by these *new Laws* of Disputation, yet thus much is out of Question, that our Blessed Saviour thought he quoted Scripture; when he only drew an Inference from it, *John 7. 38. He that believeth on me (as the Scripture hath said) out of his Belly shall flow Rivers of Living Waters.*

But, 3. As I am dissatisfied with our Authors Inference from the Doctors words, so I am much more with the Reason that he assigns to make good his Inference: His Inference is, *That the Doctor, from Christs Person, learns greater, deeper Mysteries, than Christ hath Revealed in his Gospel.* The Proof is this: For so he adds soon after, *That these properties of God (his pardoning Mercy) Christ hath revealed in his Doctrine, in that revelation he hath made of God and his Will.* The Sinews and Nerves of which Argument, lie visible. The Doctor asserts, *That these properties of God are revealed in the Gospel*: Ergo, It's plain, that *He asserts they are not revealed in the Gospel*: That is, in broad English, he denies, because he affirms: Or he says the *Snow is Black*; because he proves, as well as he can, that it's *White*. Let none ever hereafter despair of the greatest Impossibilities; this is one of the most hopeful Essays towards the *Squaring of the Circle*, the *Doubling of the Cube*, and setting on Foot a *perpetual Motion*: And what cannot that Wit be able to do, that can prove the Doctor affirms these *Mysteries*

series are not, because he says they are in the Gospel. I confess when first I read this Passage in our Author, I examin'd the Doctors words with all possible care; nay, I wrested them almost in pieces, and wrackt them most cruelly, to try if with my weak strength I could extort any such conclusion from them, and when I had tired my self, was forced to sit down by this Determination, that either our Author, or all his Readers, are certainly Frighted out of their Wits: But yet there's something follows in the Doctors, that will yield matter of Cavil: *But the Life of this Knowledge lies in an acquaintance with Christs Person, wherein the express Image and Beams of this Glory of his Father doth shine forth:* That is (as our Author pretends to Gloss it from the Doctor) *These things are clearly, eminently and savingly, only to be discovered in Jesus Christ.* I was apt to think at first sight, that he might have some dreadful Pick at those words: *In his Person the express Image and Beams of this Glory of his Father, shine forth.* But I soon Cured my self of that Suspition, by remembering that pag. 32. Our Author himself was pretty well contented, *Christ should be so called, upon the account of his Divine Nature, although to please all Parties, he had found out a Temper, that he should be so called in respect of his Doctrines and Revelations:* And therefore without more ado, I was satisfied that the Grudge lay against those other words; *The Life of this Knowledge lies in an acquaintance with Christs Person.* Now if I might presume so far upon my Acquaintance with the Doctors meaning, as I think any one may, it's no more but this: That whereas the Scripture every

where reveals to us, that *God is a God pardoning Iniquity, Transgression, and Sin*, Exod. 34. 6. Yet the Matter is Clog'd with considerable Difficulties, and attended with great Objections; for the same Text assures us, that *He will by no means clear the Guilty*: Both the parts of this Scripture are equally revealed, both equally claim a share in Gods Veracity, and till we can be resolved to Satisfaction, how God may be *such a one as pardons Iniquity*, and yet will *by no means clear the Guilty*, till we can see how this seeming Contradiction may be Reconciled, we shall either have none, or but a faint, and Dying knowledge of it. But now Christ he is the very Life of this Knowledge, for in his Death and Sufferings we see, and know clearly, that Gods Justice is satisfied upon Christ, and his pardoning Mercy Magnified upon the Repenting and Believing sinner; and thus to know God to be a Sin-pardoning God, has indeed Life in't. For thus, to use the words of the Learned Bishop Reynolds, upon Psal. 110. *A Way is found out that things may be all one in respect of Man, as if the Law had been utterly Abrogated; and that they may be all one in respect of God, as if the Creature had been utterly Condemned*, pag. 500. This is all the Doctor here intends, wherein though he should be mistaken, yet has he not discovered a *Fellonious Intention*, and so I hope it will not prove a *Hanging Matter*. But yet our Author with his prying Eyes, can see further into a *Millstone*, than he that Pecks it: And as our *Critical Scholiasts* upon the Poets, discover *Elegancies, Figures, and great Rarities* which the poor man never Dreamt of; so can our Author discover *Errors*, multitudes of *hid-*

our Errors in the Doctor, which he neither Sleeping nor Waking was ever aware of. For, says he, *He explains himself thus: These things are Clearly, Eminently, and Savingly, only to be discovered in Jesus Christ.* Whether the Doctor say any such thing or no, we shall take the Boldness to Catechise our Author by and by; and make him produce his Chapter, Paragraph, and Page, e're we have done, or abide by the shame that is due to a Malicious Slanderer. At present I only ask which of these Terms it is that he will Duel, or will he throw down the Gantlet to them all, that we may have *Battle Royal*?

(1) *These things are only clearly to be discovered in Jesus Christ:* I see the most Innocent things may give Offence, But who would have suspected that in this place? For suppose that *Sun, Moon, and Stars, Gods general Goodness* to, his *Patience* with, and *Forbearance* of Sinners, might Intimate some such thing, that there was *Forgiveness* with God; yet surely there's a more clear account given of it in Christs Person, who was *made sin for us*, 2 Cor. 5. 21. which the Prophet *Isaiab*, Chap. 53. v. 10. calls *making his Soul an Offering for sin*: And that, methinks, clears it up a little more, than if we had been put to spell out the meaning of *Patience* and *Forbearance*, with the *Fescue* of our own understanding. And though the Scripture abundantly reveals Pardon of Sin, yet the *Manner* how, the *Reason* why, which are the very *Life and Soul* of all Knowledge, is revealed to be from the *Mercy* of God, through the *Blood of Christ*, Ephes. 1. 7. *In whom we have Redemption through his Blood, the Forgiveness of Sins, according to the Riches of his Grace.* And the rather may we be bold to say,

that the *pardon of Sin* is cleared up in the Person of *Christ*; because so *Authentick*, so *Infallible* an Author as ours is, has given us leave to believe, pag. 20. that *the Gospel-Covenant is sealed with the Blood of Christ*, and therefore we can desire no greater *Security*. And this I am sure of, from *Heb.* 8. 10. that the Summe and Substance of that Covenant, is, *I will be their God, and they shall be my People*; and a main Branch of that Covenant, *I will be Merciful to their Iniquities, and Remember their Sins no more*. If then we could but clear this one Poynt, that *the Blood which Sealed this Covenant*, was not *the Blood of a Doctrine*, nor of an Office, nor of the Church, but *the precious Blood of Jesus Christ, the Son of God, even the Blood of a Person*; it would then be clear also, that *God's pardoning Mercy is only clearly* (or so clearly however) *to be discovered in Jesus Christ*.

(2) For the Term [Eminently] if the Bluster be against that, I shall not much trouble my self, I am no great Friend to, because poorly skilled in *Metaphysical* Notions; but as it stands here in *Conjunction* with other *honest words*, I see no harm in't. To me it denotes no more, but that *the Pardon of sin*, is Notably, Chiefly, Gloriously, and in a most *Special and Excellent manner*, discovered in the Personal Sufferings of the Lord Jesus Christ: But if our Author after all this be not satisfied, but finds himself Aggrieved, the Law is open, I plead no Protection, let him take his Course, and the Remedy the Law has given him.

(3) Therefore it must needs be that last word *Savingly*, that is guilty of all, and therefore must bear the Charge brought in against the whole Sentence;

tence: That pardon of sin is only savingly discovered in Jesus Christ. I cannot tell, but I do threwdly conjecture that our Author has spoken as dangerous a thing as this comes to, and has given us sufficient warrant to distinguish between a vain, empty, Insignificant Knowledge, and an Useful, Profitable, and Saving Knowledge, pag. 36. There is (says he) a larger Notion of the Knowledge of Christ, which includes the Vertue and Efficacy of this Knowledge.--- For how true soever our Speculations be, the Scripture brands all those as Ignorant of God, who do not love, Reverence and Obey Him. Now if the Doctors Book had had but the Happiness to have seen the World after our Authors, he might have Explained himself so as to come off with a dry Head: Notwithstanding what I have said of Gods Sin-pardoning mercy, and the Knowledge thereof as in Him; yet there is another Knowledge thereof, which Includes and takes in the knowledge of this God to be our God, and pardoning our sins, which God is, only in and through the Lord Jesus Christ; and therefore the Scripture brands all those as Ignorant of God, and his pardoning Mercy, who know him not as their God, in a Covenant of Grace whereof Christ is the Mediator, and therefore without Him we can have no Saving-knowledge of, or Interest in God, or his Sin-pardoning Goodness, whatever our Speculations may be of Mercy and Grace, and Pardon to be in God.

But after all this Trouble our Author has put me to, and just as much that I have put the Reader to; the Mischief on't all is this: The Doctor says not one Word, Syllable, Letter, Jot, or Tittle of all this, but the contrary. I am sure the Reader

is startled, and his Hair begins to stand an end; What, no Truth on Earth? Is *Astræa* more than in a Fable gone to Heaven? Well Reader, when thou art come to thy self, and art a little more Cool and Composed, Consult the Doctors Book, pag. 90. Sect. 6. *There are some of the most eminent Properties of God, that there is not the least Glimpse to be attained of out of the Lord Jesus Christ, but only by and in Him; and some that comparatively we have no Light of but in Him, and of all the rest no true Light but by Him.* In which words, the Doctor evidently sorts all Gods Properties under three Heads. 1. Such whereof there is *not the least glimpse to be attained* out of Christ, and under this Head he reckons Gods Love, his pardoning Mercy or Grace to sinners. 2. Such whereof we have *comparatively no Light* but in Christ; and to this Head he refers, Gods Vindictive Justice in punishing Sin, &c. 3. *Of all the rest* he affirms we have *no true Light* but by Him: Now concerning the second sort, he says, pag. 92. Sect. 10. *Secondly, There are other Properties of God, which though also otherways discovered, yet are so clearly, eminently, and savingly, only in Jesus Christ.* Now Reader, for a tolerable pair of Eyes: Our Author would make the Doctor say, that Gods pardoning Mercy is clearly, eminently, and savingly, only discovered in Christ: But the Doctor himself says, *Sin-pardoning-mercy is not at all known, there's not the least glimpse of it but in Christ.* So pag. 91. *Out of Christ there's not the least Conjecture of it, not the least Morsel to be tasted of it out of Christ; That is, God has not any way, any where, at any time, discovered that he will pardon a Sinner but upon*
the

the Account of his Son. And now Reader, I hope I may fairly protest against our Authors Bills for the future, or however carry a very suspicious Eye over him, as being in his Quotations either sick of *supine Negligence, thick Ignorance, or transparent Malice*; and let all men know by these presents, that henceforwards I shall not take his Word for a single Farthing.

But how false or impertinent soever this be, I knew he did not raise all this dust, and make such a heavy adoe for Nothing; whatever the Doctors Principles and Assertions were, he was resolved to pay him home, and load him soundly with ill-favour'd Inferences, and mishapen Conclusions, and in that one Knack lies our Authors Master-piece. *So that (sayes he) it seems the Gospel of Christ makes a very imperfect and obscure Discovery, of the Nature, Attributes and Will of God, and the Methods of our Recovery; we may thoroughly understand whatever is revealed in the Gospel, and yet not have a clear, and saving knowledge of these things, untill we get a more intimate Acquaintance with Christs Person.* There was never any Man that made better use of *ideft's*, and so that's, than our Authour. So that! The Doctor had said, *That Christ hath revealed the Properties of God in his Doctrine, &c.* and what would you now think follows from hence? Why surely, one would think; That therefore *the Gospel of Christ makes a perfect and clear discovery of the Nature, Attributes, and Will of God*: Nay, there you are out (sayes our Author) for hence it followes, that *the Gospel makes a very imperfect and obscure discovery of them*: But what Necessity may there be to draw such a Conclusion from such

a Doctrine? I will tell thee Reader in thy Ear, *Sub Sigillo Concessionis*, as a great Secret; Otherwise as excellent a piece as ever blessed the World with New Divinity, had got a knock in its Cradle, and would have retain'd a soft place in its head all the dayes of its life; Now that which he would fain fasten upon the Doctor, is a piece of the greatest Foolery Imaginable: As if he made the Person of Christ, no part of Gospel-Revelation; whereas 'tis indeed his great Principle, that Christ is the summe and substance of it: He could never once fancy it possible to have a through understanding of the Gospel, but we must *ipso facto* have also a through understanding of Christs Person; nor to have a through understanding of the Gospel, and Christ the Subject of it, but we must have also a through understanding of Gods Nature, Attributes and Will, and of the Methods of our Recovery by Jesus Christ: But this is the Product of our Authors *So that*; which alwayes agrees with his Premises just like Brains and Stairs, Harp and Harrow.

If therefore any one will do the Doctor Justice, he must read our Authors words backwards. with a pair of Hebrew Spectacles, and that will give him a truer Account of the Doctors Sentiments. The Gospel of Christ makes a very perfect, and clear discovery of the Nature, Attributes, and Will of God; and of the Methods of our Recovery, but we can never thoroughly understand what is there revealed, unless we understand the Person of Christ, who is so considerable a part, and indeed the whole of Gospel Revelation. And by such a knowledge of Christ revealed in the Gospel, will the Person of Christ be justly advanced, and the Gospel which re-

veals

deals him greatly recommended: Shall we then smile at, or lament our Authors simple Conclusion? *This sets up a New Rule of Faith, viz. Acquaintance with Christs Person, in whom dwells all the Treasures of wisdom and knowledge.* And here a vein of his old thredbare Fallacy discovers it self, which I now perceive (like the poysonous string in the Lamprey,) he resolves shall run through his whole Discourse; *Dividing those things which God has joyned, and supposing those things inconsistent, which are indeed subservient one to the other.* *Christs Person is Revealed by the Doctrine of the Gospel, and not opposed to it; Christ as a Prophet reveals himself to our Faith as God-man, as Mediator and Redeemer, and as vested with all those Offices for the discharge of his whole Mediatory Employment.* To advance his Person is not to degrade his Gospel; the Magnifying of a Prophet is no disparagement to his Prophecie: The Honouring of a King is no reproach to his Law: The Gospel is therefore Excellent, because it reveals to us so Excellent a Person as the Word made flesh, the Person of Redeemer: *New Rule of Faith* therefore we own none, and wish heartily that they who condemn us, whilest they pretend to abhorre Idols, did not commit downright Sacriledge; that they set not up *New Rules of Faith*, upon a pretence that the Scripture is not sufficient to direct our Faith and Obedience in things pertaining to God; but it's Common for some to exclaim against feeding on the Devils flesh, who yet will sup soundly of the Broth that he is boyl'd in: But these things our Author has been told so often of, that I see it to no purpose to tell him a story, unless I could find him Ears.

But

But these are but *Pelictions* and *light Skirmishes*, our Author is preparing for a most terrible Charge upon the Doctor: These *whiffling Slanders* do but make way for the Show, like the *Turkish Spahi*, good for nothing but to fill up the *Trenches*, or blunt the edge of his Enemies Weapons, we are now waiting to receive the formidable Impression of his *Familiaries*.

Two things he will Confound us all with; First, by shewing what *Additions*, This Dr. O. and some others make to the Gospel: And then Secondly, what an unsafe way of Arguing they use:

And, [1] He will shew us, What *Additions* these men make to the Gospel, from an Acquaintance with Christs Person. I must needs say, I was extremely startled to hear a Charge of *Additions* to the Gospel brought in against any Man; I presently expected either *unwritten Traditions*, or *immediate Revelations*, or I know not what *African Monster* should stare me in the face: And I know nothing at which my Nature more recoyls, nothing more abhorring to my Temper, than such *sawcy Additions*; and the rather, because I presently remembered that dreadful Curse, *Rev. 22. 18. If any one shall add unto these things, God shall add to him all the Plagues that are written in this Book*: If Men will be *Adding*, God will be *Adding*; if Men will add their *whimsical Inventions*, God will add his *Righteous Judgements*; And for that Reason I never liked, either the *Addition* of Officers to those Christ has commanded to govern his Church, nor the *Addition* of *Canons* to those by which he has appointed his Church to be governed; I alwayes thought it safest, to leave the *Doltrine, Worship, and Govern-*
ment

ments of Christ as we found them; we may be chidden for adding, or *substracting*, but never for being no wiser than the Gospel; and when we have done our Best, and *chopt* and *changed*, we shall hardly ever make better than those Christ made for us: If therefore our Author can but prove his Declaration as he has layd it, I am his absolute Creature, his prepared Man, and shall be sure to find for him against the Doctor, and a thousand more Innovators: But at last I perceive, all this is but the old stratagem of his Neighbours of *Bilings-gate*, where the crafty Slut calls her Opponent Whore first, lest she should be prevented with as bad language, and better Proof.

But there are no less than Three Additions that this one single Doctor has made to the Gospel. In which (as he sayes) is summ'd up all true Wisdom and Knowledge, and not any one of them to any purpose to be obtained, or is manifested, but only in, and by the Lord Christ; Now though our Author had almost pored his eyes out with seeking for these things in the Gospel to no purpose, yet itill he was so perspicacious as to espy one sorry, single, little word [by] which the Doctor had fallaciously added, so include the Revelations made by the Gospel. Whether that little word was added fallaciously or no, I shall not at present determine; but this I will say, that it was as mischievously and enviously added, as ever any word of that Bigness was added in the world; of set purpose no doubt, and propense Malice, to spight our Authors design, and most inhumanely and barbarously, to cross all his Projects: For it's plain, that the Particle [in] referres to [obtaining,] and this other Particle [by] to [Manifesting,]

manifesting,] which by resolving the Doctors words into their distinct Propositions, is more than evident.

1. The things mentioned are *not to be Obtained but In Christ.* And,

2. The things mentioned are *not Manifested but By Christ.*

[Obtained in him,] that is, *Through his Merit, Mediation, Intercession or Procurement:* And, [Manifested by him,] that is, *By his Preaching, and the Preachings and Writings of his Evangelists and Apostles.* Now had but the Doctor left out that one word [by] as a good Natur'd man would have done, our Author would have had a fair Ear of advantage to lay hold on, for reviling him, as *excluding the Revelations of the Gospel;* and therefore I must say it again, it was *not so Civilly done* of the Doctor, nor so *like a Gentleman,* as might have been expected from him, to insert that one word, to the apparent prejudice, hazard, if not utter *disshereison* of our Author, his Cause, Learning, Rhetorick and Reputation: But yet he thinks it was *fallaciously Added,* because *his first undertaking was, to shew how impossible it is to understand these things savingly and clearly, notwithstanding all those Revelations God hath made of himself, and his Will, by Moses and the Prophets, and by Christ himself, without an Acquaintance with Christs Person:* He that cheats me once proves himself a *Knave,* but if he over-reaches me a second time, he proves me a *Fool;* Remembring therefore how Matters stood between our Author and myself, and that I was under bond never to trust him more, I took down the Doctors Book, and with the best Eyes and Spectacles

cles I had, viewed the place, and what I find there the Reader shall have as cheap as I had it: P. 87. Com. *All true wisdom is laid up in, and onely to be obtained from and by the Lord Jesus Christ.* So thought I, hitherto we are safe, and the Person of Christ and his Gospel are very good Friends. Again p. 88. *All that wisdom which God layeth out for the discovery and Manifestation of himself, is in Christ crucified, held out in him, by him, and onely to be obtained from him:* Very good, there we have [by] again, and Gospel Revelations are not shut out of doors. Yet again p. 90. *There are some Properties of God, (as pardoning Mercy) the least glimpse whereof is not to be obtained out of the Lord Jesus Christ, but onely In him, and By him.* Hitherto we are alive, and alive's like. Once more, p. 98. *The Riches of the Wisdom and Knowledge of God, are onely hid in, and revealed by Christ:* And to give our Author his full Dose, p. 88. *God is not known upon any other Account (to Salvation) but onely the Revelation of the Son.* And now instead of disparaging the Doctor, I doubt we shall erre on the other hand, and too much magnifie him, as having written by Revelation, who twenty years before could foresee the Objections that would be levell'd against his Writings. Well, (sayes our Author) let that pass; Oh the Charity of the Man, that will not ruine his Enemy all at once! and indeed it's not good Husbandry to eat up a Man at one Meal: Polyphemus himself would reserve Ulysses for a Breakfast, when he supped so liberally over night with picking the Bones of his Mates; and yet there was as much Discretion in the Case, as Frugality, not to shew his Teeth when he could not Bite,

OF

or however not to fasten them where it might break *his Fangs*. But it will be seasonable to examine the particular Additions.

(1) The first is, *concerning the knowledge of God, his Nature, and Properties*. And here the Doctor has made a great Addition, viz. that *The Love of God to sinners, could never have entred into the heart of Man but by Christ*, p. 90. Now our Author promises us, that *he will not examine particularly every thing the Doctor says*: Of which we have had good proof all along; for 'tis not his Genius to trouble himself with any more than what may conveniently serve his purpose, but without considering either Antecedents or Consequents, to Nibble at some Expression, that seems most lyable to Exception; but herein we begge not his favour, onely demand Justice; That he may not Usurp a Liberty to suppose, that the Doctor asserts *Revelation to be wholly silent in this Matter*. Revelation silent! Alas, it rings loud with the continual sound of Gods *pardoning Mercy* to Sinners, onely the Doctor judges, that *Revelation directs us to the Mercy of God through a Mediator, for the obtaining of it*: When therefore our Author asks so pertly, whether the Doctor be not a confident Man to lay down such a Position: I onely return, that I have known our Author far more confident upon far less Grounds; when the Doctor has a Foundation for his Confidence, let him be so and spare not: A great deal less Confidence may be sinfull when it wants a Basis proportionable to beare its weight; and a great deal more Justifiable, when it's born up with sufficient Warrant: Tell not me of the Doctors Confidence, but examine his Reasons for

it, and let us see what our Author can do to dis-
mount it. Truly he offers us but *one thing*, but
I assure you, it's a *knacker*: *The Experience* (says he)
of the whole World confutes him: Never was Man
so confuted and confounded as he, that stems the
Experience of the whole World; for though I ever
look'd upon Experience as a very ticklish way of
Confutation; and the best way of employing them
is to Experience in our own Souls the Virtue and
Efficacy of certainly revealed Truths, and not to
make them the Umpires of questionable Doctrines,
yet I should be loth to run counter to the universal
Sentiments of Mankind, and the Experience of the
whole World shall carry a mighty stroke in my
Judgement; but has our Author taken their Expe-
riences by the Pole? and do they one and all give in
their Suffrages against the Doctor? Yes, *Both Jews
and Gentiles, who knew nothing of what Christ was
to die in order to our Recovery, did believe God to
be gracious and mercifull to sinners*. I must own it,
That Jews and Gentiles are a sufficient enumeration
of particulars; they did once divide the World be-
twixt them, and if they both agree in their Verdict
against the Doctor, *Nemine contradicente*, he is gone
for ever, being over-born with Epidemical Expe-
rience.

For the Jews, the Day is like to goe for our
Author, if it be true, what he tells us, That God
assured them he was a *Gracious and Mercifull God*,
pardoning iniquity, transgression and sin, which cer-
tainly he is; and then that *They knew nothing at all
of what Christ was to die for our Recovery*; but all
the stick lyes there, and we must enter a *Friendly
Debate* with him upon the issue. For, 1. What

M

ever

ever Manifestation of Gods *Sin-pardoning Mercy* was given to the Church of Old, it had reference to the *Blood of Christ*, who was as truly sacrificed to their Faith, as he was crucified to the Faith of the *Galatians*, Galat. 3. 1. The Jewish Sacrifices were Types designed, and appointed by God, to represent that *one Sacrifice*, which Christ should once offer upon the Cross to God; and without reference to the *Expiation of Sin*, *Atonement* and *Propitiation* of God made by him, and manifested by them, it would have puzzled the Faith of any particular person, that God would pardon Sin, notwithstanding that Revelation, *Exod. 34. 6.* for it is not immediately added, — And *that will by no means clear the guilty*? God in that place, reveals to Moses his Name, that is his Nature; and if we consult particulars, we shall find, that it is as fair a Lesson in Gods Name, *not to clear the guilty* (under which Character all the world stand before God, *Rom. 3. 19.*) as to *pardon iniquity*; but all this was cleared up, and made easie by a believing attendance to those *bloody Sacrifices*, which though weak in themselves, yet received a *Sacramental strength* from Him, who travelled in the greatness of his; to reconcile God and Man by the *Blood of his Cross*. 2. There's nothing more vain and idle, than to assert that the *Jews knew nothing at all of what Christ was to do*, in order to our *Redemption*. For it was sufficient for that *Dispensation*, that God had Revealed a *Mediator*, who should take up the Controversie between God and sinners, and this he did, when it was early day with the world, to *Adam*, when received into a *Covenant of Grace*: 'Tis true, the more *mighty Circumstances* of which, and how

He

He should come, in what manner he should accomplish his work, might be veiled with some Obscurities, and perplexed with some difficulties at the first; yet still they had a Promise in the Lamp; that the Seed of the Woman should bruise the Head of the Serpent; which the Apostle interprets, Heb. 2. 14. by destroying him that had the Power of Death; even the Devil: And as it seemed good to the Wisdom of God to give forth the Promise at first in gross, so in process of time to graduate and heighten the discovery of the Messiah: That there should come a deliverer out of Sion, to turn away ungodliness from Jacob; Isa. 59. 20. was evidently laid before their Faith; to these Revelations did true Believers attend, and by this Key did they open the difficultie, how God should be a God pardoning Iniquity, and yet by no means clear the Guilty: And as the prefixed time of Christs appearing in the World drew nearer, so the Prophecies, and Promises of his Person, Nature, Work, and Design thereof, with the Circumstances attending it, were multiplied, and more explicitly made out to them; that so as they were growing up out of the State of Childhood, and emerging from under their Bondage, the discoveries of a Saviour might enlarge their Hearts and Minds in Knowledge, Joy, Love and Peace: By Isaiah it was revealed, that he should be born of a Virgin, Isa. 7. 14. that he should be Immanuel, God with us, therein discovering both his Natures in one Person, and his design to bring God and Man into one Covenant: By the same Prophet was it distinctly revealed, what should be his Work, and Employment, his Dignity and Authority, and the Success of all. Isa. 9. 6. For unto us a Child is

born, unto us a Son is given; and the Government shall be upon his shoulders, and his Name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace, of the increase of his Government and Peace there shall be no end: By the same Prophet it was revealed, Chap. 53. by what means mainly he should accomplish the Ends of his coming into the World; by being wounded for our Transgressions, bruised for our Iniquities, bearing us by his stripes; by Gods laying upon him the Iniquities of us all; that it pleased the Father to bruise him, to make his Soul an Offering for sin; by the travail of his Soul, by pouring it out to death, being numbered amongst the Transgressors, and making Intercession for them; Vers. 6. 10, 11, 12. By the Prophet Daniel was revealed, his Death, the precise Time of it, and for what he dyed, Dan. 9. 24, 25, 26. Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people, and upon thy Holy City, to finish the Transgression, to make an end of sin, to make Reconciliation for Iniquity, to bring in everlasting Righteousness, — and after sixty two weeks shall the Messiah be cut off, but not for himself: And is all this Nothing? Just Nothing in our Authors Arithmetick? If this be his Nothing, for Charities sake let him tell us what is one of his somethings: No; all this while the Jews knew nothing at all of what Christ was to do, in order to our Recovery; But it became our Author, who was to assign little work, very little to Christ when he was come, to allow just nothing to be known of him before he came. But then it seems the Apostle Paul was besides the Book, as well as the Doctor, for he protests, Acts 26. 22, 23. That he spoke none other things than those

those which Moses and the Prophets did say should come, that Christ should suffer, and that he should be the first that should rise from the dead: Upon our Authors Principles, it were easie to prove, that Paul never spoke one word of Truth in the whole Course of his Ministry; and the Apostle Peter was as lamentably mistaken as he: 1 Pet. 1. 10. *Of which Salvation the Prophets have enquired, and searched diligently, who prophesied of the Grace that should come unto you; searching what, and what manner of time the Spirit of Christ, that was in them did signifie, when it testified before-hand the sufferings of Christ, and the Glory that should follow: And yet we have the testimony of Christ himself, a witness greater than all Exception. Luke 24. 25, 26, 27. O souls and slow of heart to believe all that the Prophets have spoken, ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and so enter into his Glory? And beginning at Moses and all the Prophets, he expounded unto them in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself: No doubt many lazy and drowsie Jews, not duely attending to the Concernment of their Souls in these matters, knew little, or to little purpose, of what God spoke to them by Sacrifices and Types, what that oecconomy pointed at; they might not possibly regard the Prophecies or Promises of a *Messiah*, nor is it any wonder, when we consider how little sleepy Formalists, dreaming Professors, and sortish Hearers understand of him at this day, who know no more of Christ, his Person, Office, Work and Design than that ignorant Papist who being asked, *Who Christ was?* answer'd, he believed he was as good a man as St. Patrick; Or that other who concluded that Christ was something, that was good, or*

if they would never have put it into the Creed. But then there were diligent Enquirers, and Conscientious Searchers; whose Faith engaged them in the pursuit of Eternal Life, and these saw the day of Christ, and rejoiced in the Sight. But, 2. It's an odde and perverse way to take the measure of the Jewish knowledge of Christ, from our own clearer Light: We see clearer than they, yet will it not follow that they were stark blind; though it be *Mid-day* with us, it was not *Mid-night* with them; and for my part, I more wonder that they at the Break of day saw so much, and we at Noon comparatively see so little; and if some mens Designs take place, we shall in a short time see less than they, and what to the Jews was a difficulty, must be to us a Crime, viz. to have any Acquaintance with the Person of Christ.

2. And if indeed the Jews knew nothing at all of Christ, they could not then mock the Gentiles, who could not well be in a worse case, nor come under a more dismal Character than to be without Christ. But to come a little nearer to our Author. 1. What if some of the Gentiles also knew something, and something very considerable of a Redeemer? I take Job to have been in that number, and yet he knew that his Redeemer lived, and that he should stand in the latter day upon the Earth; Job 19. 25. Which place our Author cannot question referres to Christ, seeing the Liturgy of the Church of England, in the Office of Burial, applies it so; and I hope it shall never be said, that as they Subscribe the Articles in Jest, so they Worship God in Jest too: But to purchase his Favour, let it be supposed that the Gentiles knew nothing at all of Christ; yet are we

we sure they knew God to be a *suspending* God: For our Authors Discourse alwayes halts of one Leg at least, and wears a Crutch, if it be not like *Momus Vulcan*, *disproportioned*, *foundered* of all four. 2. The *Jews*, they understood the Doctrine of the *Pardon of sin* to be in God, but then they understood by Promises, Prophecies, Types, Sacrifices, and the Tenor of the Covenant of Grace, that God had provided a Redeemer; the Gentiles, they knew Nothing of a Redeemer, but then they knew as little of the *Pardon of Sin*: But here our Author will knock the Matter Dead by an Argument: *These Natural Notions the Heathens had of God, and all those discoveries God made of himself in the works of Creation and Providence, did assure them that God is very good; and it's not possible to understand what Goodness is, without pardoning Grace. Not possible!* that's a thousand pities! I have sometimes sat admiring our Authors singular Happiness, in defining in such so pretisely, *Necessaries* and *Impossible*, which are the two extremes of the Modes of Being: And yet our Author can at one stride or jump, pass from Necessity to utter Impossibility: Some did but venture to say, that God could not pardon sin, without some intervening security to his Justice: And there grew such a Mubbub, and Out-cry upon't, as if the *Turks* and *Tatars* had over-run all *Christian* *Home*; and yet our Author, who can climb up all the stairs, from *easy* to *difficult*, from *difficult* to *impossible*, has resolved upon the Question, that from henceforth all shall adjudge it impossible to understand what Goodness is, without pardoning Grace. But is there indeed such a close Connexion, so inseparable a gluing together of these two, that we

cannot preſcind them with the ſharpeſt act of the Underſtanding? Is it eaſier to cleave a Hair, or divide an Indivisible, than to part Goodneſs and pardoning Grace? I queſtion not when he ſhall be unleiſure, he can ſlit a thinner matter a great deal than this is: But yet, 1. The Apoſtle Paul, Acts 14. 16, 17. aſſures us, That God teſtified himſelf with our a witneſs, in that he did good, and gave them rain from Heaven, and fruitful Seasons. It was more than he owed to Condemned Sinners, to afford them any kind of Goodneſs; he might have rained Fire from Heaven, and ſhowres of Brimſtone upon their heads, and it was goodneſs that he did it not; In ſtead of thoſe fruitful ſeaſons, he might have ſent Famine and Cleaneſs of Teeth, and there was much Goodneſs in that; yet whether they could from hence bleſs themſelves with a well-grounded Hope that he would pardon their Iniquities, I much queſtion. And, 2. The Servant in the Parable, Math. 18. 26. could underſtand the difference between forbearance, and acquittance: Have patience with me, and I will pay thee all. Time and Day were conſiderable Favours in his Judgement, though his Maſter did not throw him in the Bond. 3. I am ſure God himſelf underſtood the difference between a Reprieve and a Pardon; between that Goodneſs which he ſhews in forbearing, and that which he maniſeſts in forgiving, Rom. 9. 22. He endured with much long-ſuffering the Veſſels of Wrath, ſet to deſtruction; A preſumptuous Conclusion therefore had it been, from Gods general Goodneſs, and indulgent Patience, to argue his Forgiveneſs, and pardoning Grace. 4. Adam in the ſtate of Integrity underſtood very well, God ſo be good, he could not

not look besides a Demonstration of it; and yet no Nation of Gods Pardonings Grace was concerted with him, whereof he could have no use in his worship of, and walking with God: of threatening against sin he had, but not the least intimation that God would pardon it, till it was revealed upon another Account.

We are not here enquiring what presumptions and vain hopes secure sinners might form to themselves of Indemnity; nor how their hearts might be fully set in them to do evil, because judgement against an evil work was not speedily executed; nor what flattering thoughts might sickle their breasts; that God was such a one as themselves, because he kept silence at their proceedings; and spoke not his Fury in Thunder and Lightning; nor do we enquire what Natural earnest desires they might express, to obtain the Favour of God; what projects, plots, and contrivances they invented to relieve their guilty Consciences, wounded with apprehensions of wrath; how they skind over their Sores with some Services, and lick themselves whole with their Sacrifices and Oblations: But the Enquiry is this; What solid Ground they had from Gods common, and general Goodness, his Governing the World, his Patience, Forbearance, and long-sufferance with, his Bounty to Sinners; to conclude from thence, that he was a Sin-pardoning God? When I seriously consider into what inextricable Labyrinths and Mazes those poor Heathens did run themselves, how they were bewildred in their own Inventions; how they tyred themselves off their Leggs in their own wayes, and spent themselves to their skins with Sacrifices, if by any means it might be possible to purchase the good will

will of a Deity; I presently conclude, they had a settled fixed Apprehension of any such thing in God. For though they might hear a rumour, that there were a people in the World, towards whom God shew'd himself propitious and favourable, and that the way of the peoples part to reconcile this God to them, was by killing of Beasts, and offering up them to him in Sacrifice, and might therefore hence fall upon this practice of Sacrifices, yet not understanding the *true use* of them, what reference they had to a promised Mediator, they must needs fluctuate, and toss up and down in uncertainties about so weighty a Concern. Hence was it, that least they should not hit upon the True God, in that Crowd and Throng of Deities wherewith they had overstockt the Commons, they set up an Altar *To the unknown God*; and least they should miss the right Sacrifice, and most acceptable Offering, sometimes they Sacrificed the *worst*, sometimes the *best* of Men; and sometimes to please their God the better, they would let him choose by Lot which he would have. They tryed Conclusions with almost all sorts of Creatures, and all to answer the demands of an importunate Conscience, which as Gods Officer was alwayes haling and dragging them before the Bar of Gods Justice, to answer for their Delinquencies: Either then they had no Notices of Sin-pardoning Mercy, or what they had came not in from *the Works of Creation and Providence*, but were some scattered Beams, and broken Splinters of Traditional Knowledge, derived Originally to them from the People of God, who themselves had received it by pure Revelation, in and through a Redeemer.

All

All this while our Author sits fretting himself like
 Gumm'd Taffata, that when he has been, for two
 whole pages together, preparing his Reader to swal-
 low his Pills, yet we should cunningly pass it over
 with a dry Foot, and never bestow the least Con-
 sideration of it: That he may not therefore think
 himself neglected, we shall give him a full and a
 fair hearing. *The Light of Nature* (says he) and
 the Works of Creation and Providence, and those
 manifold Revelations God hath made of himself to
 the World, especially that last and most perfect Re-
 velation by Jesus Christ, assure us that God is in-
 finite in all his Perfections: They do so, let him
 make his best of that. And therefore that he is
 Powerfull, and can do whatever he pleases. Very
 good, go on: So Wise that he knows how to order
 everything for the best. Better and better; and yet
 p. 30. he tells us, *Doug and sad Experience* proved
 that all the Means he used to reform the World,
 proved ineffectual: So Good that he designs, and
 desires the Happiness of all his Creatures, according
 to the Capacity of their Natures. Stick a Pin there.
 So Holy that he hath a Natural Love to all good
 Men; (And so Gracious too, that he made them
 Good, else they never had been so.) but he hates all
 Sin and Wickedness; (It's well Gods Hatred of Sin
 is as Natural to him as his Love of Good Men.)
 And will as certainly punish all Obstinate and In-
 corrigible Sinners; but yet that he is patient and
 long-suffering towards the worst of Men, and uses
 various Methods to reclaim them, and is as ready
 to pardon them when they return to their Duty, as
 a kind Father is to receive an humble and penitent
 Prodigal. Where there are some things that wound
 our

our Authors Cause to the Heart, and nothing prejudicial to the Truth which he opposes. For, 1. He grants, that *Gods Love to good Men, and his Hatred of Sin*, are both *equally Natural*, and therefore I suppose *Essential* to him. 2. That *Gods punishing obstinate Sinners*, is *equally Natural* to him with his *rewarding Good men*. But, 3. The Fallacy of all is, that *lapsed Man* stands related to God as a *Father*; whereas he should have proved, and not supposed, that the *Light of Nature* or *Scripture* discovers any other Relation of a *Revelted Sinner* unto God, than that of a *Creature to his Creator*, and a *Subject to his Governour*; before he be taken into that *special Relation of a Son to a Father*, by Adoption in Christ. 4. A Supposition that God is ready to *pardon Sinners* when they return to their Duty, is *ambiguous, vain*, and (as he takes it) *false*. *Ambiguous*, for who can prophesie whether he means an *entire, perfect, and universal return to Duty according to the first Covenant*, or no? And *Vain*; for admitting that God is ready to pardon Sinners upon their Return, Man is but where he was, till he be enabled by *Grace* to return: And as *False* as *Vain* and *Ambiguous*; for we find no Revelation that God will pardon *past sins* upon our Return *for the future*, without reference to that *Compensation* which he has provided for his *wronged Governing Justice* by *Jesus Christ*. 5. There's a great Cheat put upon us in those words, *The Light of Nature, the works of Creation and Providence, those manifold Revelations God hath made of himself*, especially that last and most perfect Revelation by *Jesus Christ*, assure us, &c. If he supposes that any one of these singly considered, will assure us

of

of all that followes, especially that God is thus ready to pardon Sinners, 'tis the very thing in Question, and ought to have been strongly proved, and not weakly supposed; but if he take them jointly, including the Revelation made by, and through Jesus Christ, we grant it; but then the misery on this, this is the thing he should have fought against; the Doctors own Assertion, at which he has such an aking tooth; That Gods pardoning Mercy could never have entered into the Heart of Man but by Jesus Christ; but now see how neatly he would shuffle off the business. These Properties of God are plainly revealed in the Scripture without any further acquaintance with the Person of Christ. But this will not doe his work: For, 1. What's now become of the Light of Nature, if after all, we must be beholden to the Light of Scripture? But thus the poor Gentiles after all his zealous stickle in their Cause, are left in the lurch, to shift for themselves as well as they can. 2. That these Properties of God are plainly revealed in the Scripture, is very true, but then the plainness of their Revelation lyes in this, that God will pardon Sinners upon the Account of a Mediator; Perhaps he would put a trick upon us by that word [Farther] and therefore to content him, let him understand, that we own all these Properties of God to be plainly revealed in Scripture, without any further Acquaintance with Christs Person than what is therein Revealed. But our Author jogs on still. Had Christ never appeared in the World, yet we had Reason to believe, that God is thus wise and good, [viz. to pardon Sinners,] and holy and mercifull, not onely because the Works of Nature and Providence, but the Word of God assures

assures us he is so; but let me wedge in a word for
all his Haste. 1. *The Word of God assures us not*
he is so without reference to a Mediator: And if
Christ had never appeared in the World first or last,
perhaps we had had no Word of God; and if we had,
there would not have been one syllable in that Word
of the Pardon of Sin, but of the Wrath, and just
Vengeance of God due to it. 2. *Jesus Christ was*
once to appear in the World, to reconcile God and
Man; and as without Revelation we had never
known, so without his Interposition we had never
enjoy'd the Pardon of Sin. The truth is, Christ was
a Teacher and a Prophet, to reveal the Nature and
Will of God, before his Appearance in the flesh;
The Spirit of Christ signified before-hand the Suf-
ferings of Christ; and the Glory that should follow.
1 Pet. 1. 11. and those Sufferings had a Virtue and
Efficacy to procure the Pardon of Sin long before
they were actually undergone; for in Gods Accep-
tation he was a Lamb slain from the Foundation of
the World; yet still our Authors Latum is not run
down: The appearance of Christ did not first dis-
cover the Nature of God to us: No sure; God had
revealed himself to be such a God long before; yet
still upon the Account of that Propitiation and
Atonement which in infinite Wisdom and Grace
he had provided. Acts 10. 43. To him give all the
Prophets witness, that through his Name, whosoever
believeth on him, shall receive Remission of sins: It's
much to a little, that our Author will start off all
this with a fine Tale of a Tub; that it's not the Per-
son of Christ, but a Doctrine, a Gospel, a Church,
an Office, or something, or nothing, provided it be
not Christ himself, that is here intended; but the
Apostle

Apostle has hedged out that Evasion, v. 39. It's he
 that was slain, and hang'd on a Tree, he that was
 raised again the third day, and v. 42. he that is or-
 dained of God to judge the quick and the dead.
 And yet perhaps our Author with one Cast of his
 Office, can make it out how a Doctrine, a Church
 may be slain, and hang'd on a Tree too; and if they
 be no better than some that have troubled the world,
 it's no great matter if they were; however I shall not
 concern my self in its Confutation. For ought then
 that I can see, the Doctor may keep his Principles
 to himself, and his Confidence too, that Gods par-
 doning Grace could never have shined into the heart
 of man, but by Christ; that is, that none could have
 had any security (whatever God is in his own Na-
 ture) that ever God would or could have pardoned
 Sinners without some Provision made for the main-
 taining the Honour of his Justice, as Ruler of the
 World, by a Mediator; which onely could be the
 Lord Jesus Christ. And to shut up this matter, we
 will stand to the Determination of the Church of
 England, Art. 7. The Old Testament is not contrary
 to the New, for both in the Old and the New Te-
 stament, everlasting Life is offer'd to Mankind by
 Christ, who is the only Mediator between God and
 Man; wherefore they are not to be heard, which
 feign, that the Old Fathers did look onely for tran-
 scendy Promises. Again, Art. 18. They are also to
 be held Accursed that presume to say, that every
 man shall be saved by the Law or Sect that he pro-
 fesseth, provided he be diligent to frame his Life
 according to the Light and Law of Nature; for,
 Holy Scripture doth set out unto us onely the Name
 of Jesus, whereby men must be saved: But this Ana-
 thema

thema is become to our young Fry, *Brutus Ful-*
men.

Now after all this Lirry of our Authors, he finds it seems, that he and his Antagonists, have not discoursed *ad idem*: The Question has been about the *Sun in the Firmament*, and the Answer was concerning the *Scaffe that stood in the Chimney-corner*. For (says he) considering what these men make of Gods Love, pardoning Mercy, Justice, Patience &c. these Properties could never have been discovered but by a too familiar Acquaintance with Christs Person, for Nature and Revelation say Nothing of them. But why then did he not fix the true Notions of these things in the first place, and never torment his Reader with a wild, rambling, impertinent Story, which he now confesses was not one word to the purpose? For that which they call pardoning Mercy (he sayes) is not to be seen in Scripture Revelation, and perhaps that which he calls so, may be seen in the Discoveries of Nature, and found growing upon every Hedge: We shall go near to entertain more Charitable thoughts of the Schoolmen, and the old Systematical Divines hereafter, for they would have set the Terms of a Question to rights, and stated the due bounds of the Meaning of words, before they had made a noyse and blunder about the Confutation of their Adversaries: what our Author means by these things, we must leave in the Clouds as we found it, what others mean we are pretty well secured: But we are not so secure of our Authors Honesty in this matter, who jumbles together those things which the Doctor had separated, and puts them all (Pell Mell) into the common Box, as if he had asserted, That the Love

of

of God to Sinners, his Justice against Sinners, his
 Patience with, and Long-suffering of Sinners, were
 none of them discoverable but by Christ; whereas
 the Doctor plainly and in terms asserts that Gods
 Justice, Patience, Long-sufferance, may be other-
 wise known, as we have heard before, and shall see
 again by and by: The Rise of our Authors Fury
 and Indignation against the Doctor, is from these
 words, p. 93. *Com. God hath manifested the Na-
 turalness of his Righteousness unto him, in that it
 was impossible that it should be diverted from Sin-
 ners, without the interposing of a Propitiation. Now*
 (says he) *this is such a Notion of Justice as is per-
 fectly New, which neither Scripture nor Nature*
acquaint us with: And if it be so, I could heartily
 wish it underwent the Deleatur of an Expurgatory
 Index: but how strangely is our Author wheel'd
 about! it was but p. 42. that he deliver'd it with as
 much Confidence as most men are guilty of, That
 the Light of Nature, the Works of Creation and
 Providence, besides Revelation, doe assure us that
 God hath a Natural Love for all good men, but that
 he hates sin, and will certainly punish incorrigible
 sinners; from whence we might have been prone
 enough to have dropt into such an Error, that if
 Hatred of Sin, be as Natural to God, as his Love
 to good Men, he cannot but hate the one, and love
 the other: for God cannot act against his Nature,
 and must act according to his Nature. Nay, we
 should have concluded, that it holds more strongly
 a great deal, for his hatred of the one, than for his
 love of the other; seeing there's something of sin in
 good men, in the best of Men, which may allay his
 Love towards them, consider'd in their single and

N

Personal

Personal Capacities, but there's *nothing at all* in sin, not the least that may *qualifie* his Indignation against sin: And had we not been snib'd, we should have ventur'd further to say, that as God has a *Natural Love* to good Men, and will *not fail* to reward them; so he has a *Natural displicency* against sin, and therefore will *not fail* to reward it according to its demerits: And then because we are assured from a surer hand, *Rom. 6. 23.* That *the wages of sin is death*; which *by the opposition*, clearly intends *eternal death*; we could not much doubt, that a righteous and holy God will give to every one their wages, without the interposition of that Propitiation, whereof our Author makes so light: Thus I say we had concluded, but that our Author limits the Certainty of punishment to *incorrigible, and obstinate Sinners*: but this is but a *deedy qualification*, and will not much mend the matter; both because those *corrigible ones* are not so wholly corrected, but that still some remaining sins lodge in them, which are the Object of Divine abhorrency, and also because those *Corrigible ones* are onely pardoned, and received to Grace through the Interest which they have in the Sufferings of Christ; hence 1 John 1. 9. *If we confess our sins, he is faithfull and just to forgive us our sins*: which Faithfulness of God, has the Foundation of its Exercise in the satisfaction of his *Vindictive Justice*, which being once answer'd, God *that cannot lye*, promises the pardon of Sin through Christ, which because he is faithfull and just, he will make it good to the truly penitent Sinner: But what Reason will our Author favour us with of his Blunt Negative? Why, *All Mankind have accounted it an act of Goodness (without the least suspicion of Injustice*

justice in it) to remit Injuries and Offences, without exacting any punishment. I much doubt whether our Author was ever Principal Secretary of State to all Mankind, that he should be so privy to their Sentiments; his own daring Fancies, and crude Conceptions are no just Standard of their Apprehensions; and I am well assured that some of Mankind, and such whose Learning and Judgement may vye with his, and may be supposed to know Mankind as well as himself, yet think not with him in this business; but I shall lay a few things in his way, let him remove them.

(1.) The Strength of his Argument lyes in a most gross and palpable Absurdity: viz. That there is the same Reason for Gods pardoning sin against his most holy Law, that there is for a private Persons charitable remitting a trespass against himself. That God as he is the Governour of the World, may wave the Execution of the Sentence threatned against, and due to the violation of his Rules of Government, because a private Person may depart from his Right in a Six-penny matter; but these things are wonderfully mistaken: For, 1. Our Author confesses, that God will certainly punish all obstinate and incorrigible Offenders: but if sin be consider'd onely as an injury against a private Person, God may pardon even Impenitency and Incorrigibility it self: And if it be an act of Goodness to remitt such an Injury without the least suspicion of Injustice; the greater the Offence is, the greater will that Goodness triumph in remitting the greater Injury. The degree of sin alters not the Case: He that can pardon a Penny justly, may also a pound, who shall set limits to him how far he shall depart from his Right? 2. That

the Case is not the same between God and Man, is evident from hence. Man *may depart from his Right* to his Servant, may Manumitt him, and release him from *all dependance* on him, from performance of *all duty* to him, as his Master; but it's impossible to suppose that God should discharge and acquit a Creature from its dependance on, and its subjection to himself. 3. God is to be considered, not only as *our Proprietor and Owner*, but as *our Governour and Ruler*: Now the *end of Government* being the *good and welfare* of the Community, every violation of the Law claims, either that Judgement and Execution pass upon the Offender, according to it; or if not, that good Security be put in, that neither the Honour of the Legislator suffer, Offenders be encouraged, nor the Common good damnified, which was certainly done by Jesus Christ: And God himself has declared how odious such an Indifference of spirit is in a Magistrate, *Prov. 17. 15. They who justify the wicked, and condemn the Righteous, are both an abomination to the Lord.*

(2.) There's a great suspicion, nay clear evidence of injustice in a *private Person's departing from his right* in some Cases; we will suppose a summe of Money, which is all the Livelyhood of a Person and his Numerous Family; shall he not grievously sin, who shall *depart from his Right*, so far as to forgive this Debt. and turn all his Family a grazing upon the bare Common of Charity, which might have been plentifully provided for in a way of Righteousness and Justice? But still he prosecutes the Comparison: *He is so far from being Just, that he is Cruel and Savage, who will remit no offence, till he hath satisfied his Revenge*: Which were true, 1. If spoken

spoken of a *private Person*; *Vengeance* belongs not to any in that State, it's a flowre of the Crown; we are not to avenge our selves, we may prosecute our own Right lawfully, and yet even *that* managed with a *revengfull Spirit*, is sinfull. 2. A publick Person in *punishing according to Law*, ought not to be called *cruel and savage*, but *just and righteous*; when the holy God executes the Penalty of his holy Law, he does *not* *satisfie his Revenge*, but *vindicate his righteous Laws* from Contempt; he will not have them trodden under foot, to please every sawcy and malapert Caviller, that shall tax him with *savage Cruelty*: And surely, there are Terms more becoming the *Majesty of a holy God*, which our Author might have bestow'd upon the *righteous Judge of all the Earth*, in his Process against Sinners. That he is *holy in all his wayes, righteous in all his works*; that the *same Law*, which is the *Rule of Duty* and *Obedience*, is also the *Rule of Punishing* the Delinquent. But still he will be importunate: That part of *Justice* which consists in *punishing Offenders*, was alwayes look'd upon as an *Instrument of Government*, and therefore the *exalting or remitting Punishment* was referred to the *Wisdom of Governours*, &c. What he means by an *Instrument of Government*, I cannot well tell; but this I know, that *Atheism* will have God too to be an *Instrument of Government*, a *politick Engine*, to bridle the many-headed Multitude, and keep the Herd of the Vulgar in some awe: And I have learnt it from our Authors *great Friend* also, that the *Articles* of the Church are an *Instrument of Peace*, and no matter whether they be an *Instrument of Truth*; but I would gladly be satisfied in a few things 1. Who

they are that call Gods *punitive Justice* an Instrument of Government, and what warrant they have so to call it? I have read indeed that *the Law is an Instrument of Government*, but that the Righteousness and Justice of the Law-giver, in giving to every one his due, should be an Instrument of Government, seems to me an Arbitrary Term, onely invented that men might seem to say something, when indeed they say just nothing. 2. I would have a satisfactory Reason, why That part of Justice which consists in Punishing Offenders, should be an Instrument of Government; and yet the other part which consists in rewarding the Compliant and Tractable, should not be such; and why God may not as well choose whether he will reward the Righteous, as whether he will punish the Wicked. And then, 3. Whether this will be an Instrument of Government, or of Anarchy and Confusion; for if after all Obedience, and Disobedience, the Law be not the Rule of dispensing Rewards and Punishments, Good night to both; If Laws be not executed, both they and the Law-giver will be despised; and this great Instrument of Government will be like Jupiters Log, which made a noyse without execution; and the wicked will be tempted to doe evil, the Righteous discouraged in their Obedience: But let his Antecedent sink or swim, I am as little satisfied with his Consequent; That therefore the exacting or remitting of Punishment was referred to the Wisdom of Governours, who might spare or punish as they saw Reason, without being unjust in either: For, 1. God has not left it to the Wisdom of Governours, whether they shall secure the Ends of Government or no; Nay, we are assured that the Jews under their Theocracy, were

tyed

tyed up (in many Cases especially) and not left to their discretion, Numb. 35. 33. *Thou shalt take no satisfaction for the Life of a Murderer, he shall surely be put to death.* 2. What if God has obliged himself to the contrary, that he will not remitt Punishment, but has made his holy Law the Rule of his dealing with us, as well as of our walking with him? Numb. 14. 6. 18. *The Lord is long-suffering, and of great Mercy; and by no means clearing the guilty.* Nay, what if this be the immediate result of Gods Nature, supposing an Offender? the Text makes this as essential to God as any of his other Attributes; and if our Author can exclude one, another when it shall serve the Scene, will exclude all the rest, and then we shall have a God to our Authors hearts desire.

In the Conclusion of this Point, our Author unbosoms himself to us, and ingenuously discovers the bottom of his heart; namely, that the Reason why he is so zealously engaged against the *Vindicative Justice of God*, is because he was wellaware, that it would put in strongly for the Necessity of Christs Death: And he understood his Interest well enough; for the *Justice of God* once admitted, enforces the Necessity of Christs Death, if it be supposed, that God will declare himself just in the pardoning of a Sinner; and the Death of Christ also reciprocally will prove the holy peremptoriness of Gods Justice against Transgressors: For, what else could call for the Death of the Lord Jesus Christ? The Lord Jesus Christ was the only begotten, and dearly beloved of the Father; free from Sin, in whom no guile was found, 1 Pet. 2. 22. and not onely voyd of Sin, but full of Grace, exact in his Obedience,

dience, Matth. 3. 16. *he fulfill'd all Righteousness;* and he durst avow it, John 8. 29. *That he alwayes did those things that pleased his Father;* so that his Eternal Father, in the view and Prospect of these things, declares that he was *well-pleased with him,* *Matth. 17. 5.* Now let us consider, how the Father dealt with *this Dear, this Holy, this onely Son,* *Isa. 53. 10.* *It pleased the Father to bruise him, he hath put him to grief; he laid upon him the Iniquities of us all;* what shall we say to these things? the Father was *well-pleased with his Person,* with *his Obedience,* and yet *well-pleased with his sufferings* also; he was *made a Curse,* who was *blessed for ever,* *Gal. 3. 13.* he dyed a *penal Death,* who had no Guilt, *Rom. 8. 32.* *God spared not his own Son;* *ex ipsorum* he spared him not in exacting Punishment; *Death came into the World by sin, and yet Christ dyed, who never sinned,* *Rom. 5. 12.* The Law in its Penalty had nothing to do with him, who had *not offended the Law in its Rule;* So that I profess, I know no greater wonder in the world, than that the Father would have him *suffer,* and that he should be *Capable of Sufferings;* till the wonder be removed by viewing Christ in the *stead* of others; and thus the Scripture *alloys the difficulty,* *Isa. 53. 10.* *His Soul was made an Offering for sin;* Nay, he was *made sin for us,* though he *knew no sin, that we might be made the Righteousness of God in him,* *2 Cor. 5. 21.* He so loved the Church, that he gave himself for it: And appearing in this Quality; Death, the Officer of Gods violated Law might justly arrest him, and the Father be pleased to bruise him, delighted in his Sufferings upon one account, who was so infinitely satisfied in
his

his Person upon another : And yet all this while our Author can see no necessity of Christs Death. I should rather have thought (sayes he) that Gods requiring such a Sacrifice as the Death of Christ, was not because he could not do otherwise, but because his infinite Wisdom judged it the most effectual way of dispensing his Grace. Then, 1. It seems though Gods infinite Wisdom saw this the best way, yet it might have consisted with his Wisdom to have pitch'd upon a worse ; and then it will be a Question, whether that had been Wisdom or no : For we are told, p. 48. That Wisdom consists in the choyce of the fittest and best Means to attain an End, when there are more wayes than one of doing it : If then Wisdom consist in choosing the fittest and best Means, and the Death of Christ was the best Means for dispensing of Gods Grace, either it was impossible for God to choose any other way than this, or it is possible for God to act in a way not consisting with Wisdom. But, 2. Our Author had highly obliged the World, had he discovered how sin might otherwise have been expiated than by the Sacrifice of Christs Death. The Jews have pitch'd upon a Cock, and at last upon their own Death : But it's twenty to one, when our Author shall substitute any in the room of the perfect Sacrifice of Christ, we shall find as many real Inconveniencies in it, as he has found imaginary absurdities in the Necessity of Gods requiring satisfaction to his Justice, and Christs Tending it upon the Cross. But, 3. Who ever asserted simply that God could doe no otherwise than to require the Sacrifice of Christs Death ? Alas, our Author is wide the whole Heavens in this Matter ; It must first be supposed, that God will treat with

the

the sinner, and that Christ will accept the Terms of being a Mediator between God and Man; The Necessity proceeds upon a presupposed Voluntariness, both in the Father and in the Son; and when you have supposed them, there are who will dispute it with our Author when he pleases, that upon supposition God will accept and justify a sinner, a just Compensation must be made to wronged Justice.

I find our Author and his Confederates now and then speaking a good word of Mr. R. B. and I do the more wonder at it, because I did not think they had had a good word for any man but themselves; I shall therefore give him a taste out of his learned Labours, and if he likes it, he may have more at the same rate. 'Tis in his *Reasons of the Christian Religion*, Part 2. Chap. 4. Sect. 6. *No Religion doth so wonderfully open, and magnifie, and reconcile Gods Justice and Mercy to Mankind, as Christianity doth. It sheweth how his Justice is founded in his Holiness, and his Governing Relation; It justifieth it by opening the Purity of his Nature, the Evil of Sin, and the use of Punishment to the right Government of the World; and it magnifieth it, by opening the Dreadfulness, and Certainty of his Penalties, and the Sufferings of our Redeemer, when he made himself a Sacrifice for our Sins.*

But the storm is not yet over, nor our Authors Fury quite spent. Dr. O. had said, *Com. pag. 94, 95. That there are many Glympsers of the Patience of God towards Sinners, shining out in the Works of his Providence; but all exceedingly beneath that discovery which we have of it in Christ; for in him the very Nature of God is discovered to be Love and Kindness; whatever discoveries were made of* the

the *Patience and Lenity* of God to us, yet if it were not withall revealed, that his other *Attributes*, his *Justice and Revenge* for Sin, had their *allings* assigned them to the full, there could be little *Consolation* gather'd from his *Patience and Lenity*: It were very hard if a Spider could suck no *poysen* out of these words, and I should conclude she had renounced her *Nature*; but what was there in all this that could exasperate a sweet natur'd Gentleman? Whilest a sinner hangs by the *meer forbearance* of God, he hangs but over Hell-fire by a *single Thread*, and if that breaks, he falls irrecoverably into *Everlasting Burnings*; and it can be little *Consolation* (the Doctor was gentle, he might have used a harsher word, and said *just none at all*,) to an awakened Conscience, to have a place in Gods *forbearance*, when he has none in his *Forgiveness*, or to depend upon mere *patience*, without an interest in Gods *pardonning Mercy*: God may have *patience* with, when he has no *pardon* for a sinner; he had so for the Old World, for *Sodom*, for *Jerusalem*, which yet perisht under his just displeasure: A sensible Soul will be apt to argue thus, I am reprieved, but is my *Pardon* sealed? God visits not my *Iniquities* upon me, but will he remember them no more? Those that are the *familiar Acquaintances* of *Nature*, and of the *Cabal* to Common Reason, have told me, that *Forbearance* is no *Acquittance*; that *Patience* abused, turns into *Fury*; Nay perhaps it may be in Judgement that a Sinner is forborn; for God hath sometimes suffered the *Nations* to walk in their own wayes, *Acts 14. 16.* And endured with much long-sufferance the *Vessels of Wrath* fitted to destruction: But now through Christ the *Nature* of
God

God is discover'd to be Love and Kindness; for seeing Provision is made for, and regard had of all his other Attributes and Essential Perfections, God can secure to himself the Glory of them all, and yet the Sinner escape wrath to come: And indeed it's altogether as unaccountable why God should be mercifull to the reproach of his Holiness, as why he should be severe to the disparagement of his Mercy; As the Goodness of God naturally discovers it self in doing good, (where all due requisites are found) so does Justice as readily exert it self upon the Sinner, where a Propitiation doth not interpose; And if Conscience were rightly instructed in its Office from the Word, it would mind the Sinner, that God can be just in destroying, without the least Impeachment of his Mercy and Goodness; since Mercy it self is not obliged to plead for the Sinner, without respect had to the other Properties of that God who is Essentially what he is: But has our Author never a Stone to throw at the head of this Truth? Two things he offers, most lamentable Ignorance, and horrid Blasphemy.

(1) Here's most wretched Ignorance. A happy Change (sayes he) this, from all Justice, to all Love. No Sir, don't trouble your self, here's no Change at all, happy or unhappy: God is the same holy, just, righteous, gracious and loving God that ever he was, onely, (sayes the Doctor) he's otherwise discovered: Justice and Mercy are not contrary things in God; he can be all Love and Mercy, and yet punish the Sinner that cannot plead the Death of Christ for his Discharge; and he can be all Justice too, and yet pardon the believing, repenting Sinner through Jesus Christ: The Change is not made in God,

God, with whom is *no-variableness nor shadow of turning*, but the Change is made in the State and Condition of the Creature, who once standing upon his own bottom, and so considered by a holy and righteous God, was the Object of just displeasure, but now being *found in Christ*, and so eyed by God, is in another Capacity, and meet to enjoy the benefit of that Grace and Love, to which before such Qualification he had no right, and whereof he was utterly incapable.

(2) I wish *Ignorance* had been the worst that might be charg'd upon his Discourse; for certainly here's a vein of the most unparallel'd *Blasphemous Drollery*, that ever faced the World with an *Imprimatur*; except *Friendly Debates, Ecclesiastical Policies*, and some few others of the same *Kidney*: And first he will represent the Holy God in his taking Vengeance, or requiring Satisfaction, like an *angry passionate Man*; and the Grace of God upon the Account of Christ's Death and Sufferings, to the Kindness of a *vengefull Man when he has glutted himself with Revenge, and his Passion is over*. I think it might become our Author, or the proudest Worm on Earth, to have spoken more reverently of the way of Gods dealing with repenting Sinners through our Lord Jesus Christ: That discomposure and perturbation of Mind to which frail man is obnoxious, falls not upon the great God; he can *turn the wicked into Hell, and all those that forget God, without Passion; Fury is not in me*, saith God, *Isa. 27. 4*. An earthly Judge in his private Capacity, may weep when he pronounces Sentence of Death against a Malefactor, and yet remember that he is a Judge; and cut off from the
City

City of God the wicked of the Land: Nihil minus quam irasci patientem decet: Nothing is more uncomely in him that punisheth than Passion: And though we read of Gods Anger, Wrath, and Fury; yet it becomes us to conceive of God according to his Dignity, even when he represents himself to our Capacity; Though God humble himself, we have no warrant to abase him; whatever things are attributed to God which are common to Men, it's our Duty to garble out all the Imperfections and Frailties that those Qualities are mixed and attended with in Men, before we ascribe them to God.

But this is not the worst, he will strain his impious Drollery a few Notes higher: *The summe of which is, that God is all Love and Patience when he has taken his fill of Revenge, as others use to say, the Devil is good when he is pleased.* This is indeed the summe of all our Authors blasphemous Froth, but neither the total summe, nor any particular of what the Doctor has ever asserted: The summe of the Doctors words is this: *That God is the righteous Judge of all the Earth, and that it's a righteous thing with him to render to every Man according to his Works, and yet he has pleased to admit of Satisfaction to be made by his Son Jesus Christ, who most willingly offer'd himself a Propitiatory Sacrifice to God; In which Son of his, whoever shall believe, God is ready to pardon and forgive him: And now must the plain Truth of the Gospel be thus muffled up, and disguised in ugly Expressions, to render it lyable to scorn and contempt? Thus have the Papists array'd the Martyrs of Jesus in the Sambenit or Devils-Coat, first shewing them as Hereticks, and then sacrificing them to the flames. I see he has*

furnish'd

furnish'd himself with a Creep-hole, It's not as he,
but as others say;

Sed male dam recitas, incipit esse tuus.

As 'tis applyed it's his own, and yet it hits not neither: For the Devil is never so pleas'd as to become Good, nor God ever so displeas'd as to become Evil: Nay, the Devil is then worst when he is pleas'd, for the greatest evil pleaseth him best, and God is gloriously excellent when he is displeas'd, for the greatest Evil is the Cause of his displeasure. But let this pass for an Ornament of our Authors style, which is indeed embellish'd with Figures, but none more beautifies it than this, which we may well call a *Satanismus*.

He has not yet done, he has not loaded the Truth with Reproach to his mind, and therefore one *id est* will doe it. That is, he would not believe God himself, should he make never so many Promises of being good and gracious to Sinners, unless he were sure he had first satisfi'd his Revenge. But let him not be angry: We believe every Promise that God has made of being gracious to Sinners, but we say, we cannot find one such, without Provision first made for the securing Gods Righteousness. Shew us a Promise that is, *Yea and Amen*, and not in Christ. Produce that Promise wherein God is engag'd so justify a Sinner, and not be just himself; quote us the place from whence we may flatter our selves, that God will destroy any of his Attributes to save a Sinner. However therefore our Author has represented God, he has thus represented himself. 1. That he is a Holy God, *A God of purer eyes than to behold evil*, and that he cannot (which is the Word so displeases the Man) look on iniquity; he cannot
but

but see it wherever it is, as he is omniscient; and yet he cannot see it, cannot look on it, wherever it is, without Abhorrency: He is a holy God, and from his Natural and Essential Holiness does it arise, that he cannot behold sin with Approbation, and therefore must and will punish it: Thus has he represented himself, *Psal. 5. 4, 5, 6. Thou art not a God that hath pleasure in wickedness, neither shall evil dwell with thee; The foolish shall not stand in thy sight, thou hatest all the workers of Iniquity.* 2. God further testifies of himself, that he is the righteous Judge of all the Earth, Governing and Judging the World according to his own holy Nature, and the Rules of his holy Law; and not according to our Authors good Nature, and the Rules that he shall prescribe to him; and therefore, 3. Agreeable to his holy Nature, and holy Law; it shall not be with the Righteous after the way of the Wicked, nor with the Wicked after the way of the Righteous, for the Judge of the whole Earth must do right; This God has revealed, and we believe, and as much more as shall be made known to us to be of his Revelation. But that God is so indifferent about Sin, as these men would persuade us, that those Scoffers, *Zeph. 1. 12. The Lord will not do good, neither will he do evil,* did charge God wisely, we do not believe; but that he insults upon the Honour of his Attributes, the Credit of his Laws, the Vindication of his Authority; which Ends if they may be otherwise attained than by Christ, and his Sacrifice, yet our Author has not yet discover'd to us the Way; and however he has confessed that

• *Christ is the best and most effectual Means of attaining them.*

There

There are a few drops which follow this Storm, yet behind. The Doctor had said, p. 96, 97. *That God does sometimes bear with Sinners, and forbear them long, and yet there may be no special design of Mercy in it neither: But now evidently and directly, the End of the Patience and Forbearance of God which is exercised in Christ, and discovered in him to us, is the saving, and bringing unto God those towards whom he is pleased to exercise them; God is now taking a Course in his infinite Wisdom and Goodness, that we may not be destroyed, notwithstanding our sins: which a little before, p. 97, self. 15. he explains to be, by leading us to Repentance.* Now I knew it would be no difficult task to a willing Mind, to put an ugly Vizard upon the fairest Face, which thus he has done. *As before, the least Sin could not escape without a just Punishment, &c. so now the Justice of God being satisfied by the Death of Christ, the greatest Sins can do us no harm, but we shall be saved notwithstanding our sins.* But I doubt our Author will be miserably disappointed in his Markets, and lose Money by his dirty Ware. 1. *The least Sin cannot escape without Punishment.* Very true, we own it; *The wages of Sin is Death: the Threatning is level'd at Sin, as Sin, and therefore against all sin: A quatenus ad Omne valet Consequentia:* and therefore go scold with the Apostle, that which will bring him off, will bring off the Doctor. 2. *The Justice of God is Natural and Essential to him.* Well, let him mend himself how he can, we are of the same mind still, and are like to be so. 3. *He cannot forgive sin, without punishing it:* Goe on; somewhere or other the Punishment must lye, which amounts to

no more but this, that God cannot forgive sin, but in such a way as may secure his Glory. 4. *The Justice of God is satisfied by the Death of Christ*: It is so; but that Satisfaction is applied to particular persons, in that way that God has appointed, that no other of his Attributes may be diminished. 5. *Now the greatest sins can doe us no hurt*: Nay, there our Author is quite out: For Unbelief, Impenitency, Unregeneracy, obstruct the Sinners having any share in the Satisfaction of Christ, or the Benefits procured by it: But, 6. The Doctor had said, *We shall be saved notwithstanding our sins*; He does say, *we shall not be destroyed*; and let that amount (if he pleases) to *We shall be saved*. That is, 1. *Former Sins repented of, shall not be charged upon the Sinner to Condemnation*. 2. Such sins as are consistent with the state of Grace, the Power, and Predominancy of Godliness shall not eventually ruine the repenting Sinner; and for those that are inconsistent with that state, he that undertook to satisfy for them, will also take care they shall not commit them, that he may not lose the Fruit of his Death and Sufferings, and therefore he has promised that *he will put his Fear into their hearts, that they shall never depart from him*. And now I think our Author has either lost Money by his Discourse, or got it over the Shoulders: All his hopes were to persuade us, That the Doctor designed to assert, that *the satisfaction of Christ would save sinners, notwithstanding their sins lived in, continued in, delighted in, and dyed in; in sensu composito*: but let an ordinary Understanding, with ordinary diligence read over that Paragraph, and he shall find all conspiring with that great Truth, *Without Holiness no*

man

man shall see God: And thus he has talk'd his pleasure about *Mercy and Justice*.

As to Gods Wisdom, which most gloriously appears in this design of Saving sinners by Christ, the Doctor had said, *Com. 98. That Gods Wisdom in managing things for his own Glory, is clearly discovered in Christ*: And if Wisdom display it self in the works of Creation and Providence, and in his holy Law, yet still Wisdom is most eminently revealed in a Mediator; and he was the more emboldened thus to speak, because he had encouragement from the Apostle, *1 Cor. 1. 24. We preach Christ crucified; to the Jews a stumbling-block; and to the Greeks foolishness, but to them who are saved, both Jews and Greeks, the Power of God, and the Wisdom of God*: And here I confess our Author had just Cause of Complaint; That the Apostle should so unluckily place *this Wisdom in a crucified Christ*, to the utter undoing that laudable Invention of Christ for an Office; a Church, a Doctrine; and this might well vex every vein of his heart: But still the Doctor proceeds (and for ought I can see, minds our Author no more, than you would be concern'd about that peevish thing that infests your skins as you walk the streets with impotent Noyse,) shewing, That *this Wisdom of God is such a Mystery, such hidden Wisdom, such manyfold, variegated, curiously wrought Wisdom, that the Angels desire to pry into it, and the Wisdom thereof lyes much in this*: That by Christ, things are recovered into such a state, after the Confusion wherein they were involved by the Curse, as shall be exceedingly to the advantage of Gods glory. P. 98, 99. This indeed was pungent, and galled that tender part, which

cannot endure to hear too much Good spoken at once of Christs Person: For, (says he) if Justice be so Natural to God, that Nothing could satisfy him but the Death of his own Son, this may discover his Justice, but not his Wisdom. Why so? Oh the Reason is plain: Wisdom consists in the choyce of the best and fittest Means to attain an End, where there are more wayes than one of doing it, but it requires no great wisdom where there is but one possible Way. Where I am stumbled at our Authors Philosophy, as much as at his Divinity. For, 1. Saving to our Author his good Learning; Wisdom lyes also in Managing *fit Means* in such a Way as may reach their Ends effectually, that there be no disappointment in the Issue by male Administration; and herein is Gods Wisdom seen, that he carries on, as well as layes the Design of saving Sinners, with admirable Success, maugre all the Counterminings, Projects and Contrivances of Hell; One way that reaches the End effectually, is worth a thousand, that prove addle, and bring forth nothing but Wind; and he might have learnt so much from the Fable, ΠΟΛΛὰ μὲν ἴδμεν ὁ ἀλλοτρίῃ ἀλλ' αἰετοῖς ἐν μύθῳ. 2. Wisdom lyes in reconciling differing Interests, in adjusting the various Pretensions and Claims of the concerned Parties; these Contrasts of bandying Parties clashing one with another, render Healing designs difficult: The Justice of God demands Satisfaction, the holy Law of God abetts that Demand, the Truth of God backs both their Claims; and before Grace and Mercy can be actually exercised towards the Sinner, some Expedient must be found out to content those Demands; and all this God hath done in Christ, in whom Mercy and Truth have

met

met together, Righteousness and Peace have kissed each other, Psal. 85. 10. 3. It's Wisdom to find out a Means to reach an End, though there be but *that one Mean* to be found in the whole Circle and compass of Beings. We should not much reproach that Physician that should discover to his dying Patient an effectual Remedy, though it prove the only one in the world; and we will own him for an *Æsculapius*, that will prescribe to our Author a good round dose of Hellebore, and yet it's more than probable, it's the only Drug upon Earth that can purge out that frantick, insulting, petulant humour which in his Writings fills both Pages: At length seeing there is no other Remedy, our Author will allow *some small Wisdom* to appear in the Design, but then *the Knowledge of it all is owing to the Revelations of the Gospel, and not to any fanciful Acquaintance with Christ*. Still we are haunted with that old Fallacy, which by this time I had hoped had been quite worn out at the Elbowes; That because the knowledge of this Wisdom is owing to the Gospel Revelations, therefore nothing is due to him, who is the Reason and Ground of this wise and happy Contrivance: And so this Bolt also is soon shot.

(2) The second Addition the Doctor is charged with, is: *That a great part of our Wisdom lyes in the knowledge of our selves, and that both in respect of Sin, and Righteousness, and that we cannot attain to these but in and by Christ*.

And, [1] For Sin, the Doctor had said, p. 110. Com. *That our disability to answer the Mind and Will of God, in any of that Obedience which he requires, is in Christ only to be discovered*. And the

Doctor has herein asserted two things: 1. That there is in every man a *Natural Impotency* to answer the Will of God: And he seems not to be in peremptory in it as the Scripture, *2 Cor. 3. 5. Not that we are sufficient of our selves, to think any thing as of our selves, all our sufficiency is of God: It is God that works in us to will and to doe of his own good pleasure*; and if we be deceived by these and many other such Testimonies, the Church of England was misled by them as well as we: *Art. 10. The Condition of Man after the Fall of Adam, is such that he cannot turn and prepare himself by his own Natural strength.* Our Author durst once appeal to the Experience of the whole world; will he stand before the same Tribunal, and be judged in this Case? There are such *universal Complaints* about this very thing, and such dismal stories all men tell of their *Impotency*, and *disability* to answer Gods Laws, that that Man should labour under insupportable prejudices, that will controule all mens Experiences; I know They talk most of the *Easiness* of keeping Gods Law, who never tryed it, and perhaps if they were well pump'd, they mean nothing but how *easie it is to break it*: Let any man set himself in his own strength to discharge one single Command of God in its full extent and latitude, keeping it with his whole heart, laying out his whole strength and might therein, which that holy Law challenges, let him attend to the Purity and Perfection of that, and severely compare himself thereby, dress himself in that Glass, and when he has made some fruitless Essayes, and been foyled and baffled with vain attempts, he may then perhaps see more need of Christ than before, and may spare the

Expe-

ni b
Expe
will
Law
be sh
That
the D
Apost
streng
In his
streng
of Ch
How
presb
lingu
never
for
Alth
irreg
ness
B
the
thou
and
M
per
La
reg
and
tir
Na
his
de
see
a

Experience of the whole World; for his own singly will convince him of his disability to answer the Law of God, in all or any of that Obedience which he therein requireth. 2. The Doctor conceives, That this Impotency of ours is discovered clearly in the Death of Christ, wherein he is warranted by the Apostle, Rom. 5. 6. For when we were yet without strength, in due time Christ dyed for the ungodly. In his Divinity we see, a Sinner, and one without strength, are convertible terms, and that the Death of Christ supposed it. All the difficulty here will be, How our Author shall expose this Truth, and represent it to its greatest disadvantage; but he has a singular Talent that way, and whereof we need never to despair. That is, (says he) It's impossible for us to do anything that is good, but we must be Acted like Machines by an external Force, by the irresistible Grace and Power of God; And the business is done.

But, 1. Our Author is hugely out, in supposing the Doctor to assert that, It's impossible to do any thing that's good. Some good thing a Man may do, and yet not do all that's requir'd in doing it; the Material part of a Duty he may doe, and yet not perform it in such a way that it may answer Gods Law, or be acceptable to him. Bonum oritur ex integris, there must be a right Principle, a right End, and all circumstances must concur to make it entirely good: I think there are none that deserve the Name of Christians, who do not pray to God for his Grace to enable them to do their Duty; but if indeed they could perform it in their own strength, I see not what that Prayer would signifie more, than a Complement; Quid foris quæram cum domi habeam?



Why should a rich Man turn a Beggar? And indeed the Heathens Principles hung together with more Consistency, who would not trouble their Gods for what they had in their own Power, nor thank them for that which they had earned with their own fingers-ends. *Quia unusquisque sibi virtutem acquirit, nemo sapientum de ea gratias Deo egit.* Since every man is the Procurer of his own Virtue, no wise man ever gave thanks to the Gods for it.

2. He is no less mistaken, if he presumes upon his Power to tie the Doctor to use what Expressions he pleases in signifying his own Thoughts; it may be he will not use that term of *irresistible*, it will satisfy him, if Grace work efficaciously in determining the Will: And if by *irresistible* Grace no more be meant than a powerfull and effectual production of the principle of Grace in the Soul, it's no more than what God has promised in the New Covenant, Ezek. 36. 26. *A new heart also will I give them, and I will take away the heart of Stone out of their flesh, and I will give them an heart of Flesh:* And he that removes the onely resisting Principle in the Soul, [the Heart of Stone,] may be said well enough to act *irresistably* in the working of Grace: Nor can I see any danger in ascribing such a way of working to the Holy Spirit; nor did the Apostle, Eph. 1. 19, 20. — *who believe according to the working of his mighty power, which he wrought in Christ when he raised him up from the dead:* where the Apostle is not afraid, nor ashamed to ascribe the working of Faith to the same Power that raised up Christ from the dead; and he that had a mind to make a fluster with Greek like our Author, could take

take
Dine
up w
had
not t
Pow
3.
that
sion
ing
ling
Fell
you
gab
of t
sure
Spi
and
the
yet
tion
tha
kne
rin
the
to
ge
Af
mi
Ge
en
an
cli

take a fair Opportunity to tell him, what ἐνέργεια, δυνάμις, κράτος, ἰσχύς, doe signifie, and then to rub him up with ἐνέργεια τῷ κράτει τῆς ἰσχύος, and with ἐνέργεια μέρους τῆς δυνάμεως. And whether these denote not the *Creatures Impotency*, and Gods *Efficacious Power*, let the Reader judge.

3. Our Author is much mistaken, if he thinks, that the work of Gods Grace and Spirit in Conversion of a Soul to God, may be compared to the moving of a Machine: Perhaps he had seen about Billingsgate, the Mangleing of a Crane, where a lusty Fellow with a Mastiffe-Dog in a Wheel, will take you up an incredible weight, otherwise unmanageable, and he being taken with the Omnipotency of the Engine, knew not how to bestow his pleasure better than upon the Operation of the Holy Spirit. But Gods Spirit knows how to act effectually, and yet not offer violence to any of the Faculties of the Soul: He can lead the Creature powerfully, and yet in a way agreeable to its Frame and Constitution; He that has engaged, Joh. 6. 37. That all that the Father has given him, shall come unto him, knows well how to bring them in without committing a rape upon their own wills; he can make them willing, and yield by surrender, and not need to take them by storm; he can powerfully, and yet gently and sweetly lead his Creature; he makes no Assault and Battery upon it. When then the Psalmist prayes, and we with him, Psal. 119. 36. That God would encline his heart to his Statutes, there's enough in his Prayer to imply his own disability, and Gods Power, and yet enough in the Souls Inclination to exclude all Force and Violence.

But still he presseth upon the Doctor, who p. 106.

had

(202)
had said: There are Four things in sin, that clearly
shine forth in the Death of Christ, 1. The Defect
of it. 2. Mans Imporency by reason of it. 3. The
Death of it. 4. A New end put unto it. Against the
two former, he has sufficiently Discovered his feeble
Passion, the third he waves, and now against the
fourth he Rises up with incredible Zeal and Fury.
For, says the Doctor, Sin in its own Nature tends
merely to the Dishonour of God, the Ruine of the
Creature; but now in the Lord Jesus Christ there is the
Manifestation of another, and more Glorious end,
viz. The praise of Gods glorious Grace, in the par-
don and forgiveness of it, God having taken order
in Christ, that that thing which tended merely to his
Dishonour, should be managed to his Infinite Glory.
And here our Author has need of all his Machines
and Engines, that he may disorder things so as to
serve his turn of them, and therefore upon good ad-
vise no doubt reserved them all for this place.

1. One Machine which he plies, is that old Ro-
ten Engine, called Invidious Representation; and
this will do good Service still for want of a better.
Thus is (says he) lest Gods Justice and Mercy
should never be known, to the World, he appoints
and Ordains sins to this end, that is. Decrees that
Men shall sin, that he may make some of them Ves-
sels of Wrath, and others the Vessels of his Mercy,
to the praise of his Grace in Christ. It's a sad Drud-
gery to satishie wilfully blind Malice: For what more
plain from the Doctors words, than that he speaks
not Hot or Cold of Gods Ordaining men to sin, but
of his putting a New end to sin, upon supposition
that it is already in the World. Cannot God bring
Good out of Evil, but our Author must go Mad?

Its

It's a very Rufful cause that needs such Subsidies to maintain it. Let any one Read the Doctor again, pag. 112. *Sin in its own Nature tends merely to Gods Dishonour. In the Lord Jesus Christ, there is the Manifestation of another end: And as he said before, pag. 106. There's a New end put to it: of Gods Ordaining, and Appointing, and Deterring men to sin not a word, not a syllable, only he says, that supposing sin to be already in the World, carrying on its fatal Designs of Dishonouring God, Damning Souls, God has in Infinite Wisdom, Curbd and Restrained its Natural Tendency, Over-rul'd its native malice against, and thirst after the blood of souls, and made it Comply with his own Glory. So said Austin: God is so Good that He would never suffer sin to be in the World, if He were not also Omnipotent, to bring Good out of the Evil.*

2. Another Machine which our Author plies upon those words, is, *That famous Engine of Archimedes, of which he used to boast, that Give him but a place out of the World where to fix his Engine, and he would undertake to Unhinge the Earth from its Center.* The same Confidence has our Author in this Machine, which indeed never failed him: And no less truly, than commonly called a Down-right falsehood. Let the Reader mark it well; he charges the Doctor for saying, pag. 112. *Com. That the glorious end whereunto sin is appointed, and ordained, is discovered in Christ for the Demonstration of Gods Vindictive Justice, in Measuring out to it a meet recompence of Reward.* Now remember the old Caveat, *Hic nervus est sapientia nihil fidere*: Take the Book and read with all the Eyes you have, and can borrow, and there you shall find the clear contrary. *The Commi-*
tations

tions, and Threatnings of the Law, do manifest one other end of sin, even the Demonstration of Gods Vindictive Justice, in measuring out to it, a meet recompence of Reward; but here the Law stays, with it all other Light, and discovers no other use or end of it at all; but in the Lord Jesus Christ, there is the Manifestation of another, and more Glorious end, &c. And now after all this sorrow, we shall have a fine Scene of Mirth for our Divertisement. Nature (says he) would teach us, that so infinitely glorious a Being as God is, needs not sin, and misery to recommend his Glory, and Perfections: What Nature will teach us, so great a Darling of hers, the Privado to all her Mysteries cannot be Ignorant of; but in my Judgment he fetches a huge Blow to do Nothing: We believe God was perfectly happy from all Eternity in the Enjoyment of his own Self and Infinite Perfections, and needed not have recommended his Glory to his Creatures; he made not the World because he needed it, but by our Authors good leave, or without it; supposing that God will recommend his Glory, he must have something out of himself, to which he may recommend it: And on like Supposition that He will Manifest his pardoning Grace and Mercy, there must be a fit Object capable of that Grace and Mercy, unless our Author from his too much familiarity with Nature, can tell us how God can Pardon one that is no sinner, or forgive him that is not guilty. Though every sinner be not an Object qualified to receive Mercy, yet he must be a sinner upon whom pardoning Mercy is exercised; though all Misery be not a fit Object of pity, yet Pity supposes Misery; some of Gods Attributes create their Objects,

jells, as Omnipotency, but others do suppose them as Sin-pardoning Grace; and so God may be said to need Sins and Misery to recommend some of his Perfections, I am sure supposing sin and misery to exist, God has recommended his Son to us, in that while we were yet sinners Christ died for us, Rom. 5. 8. Of the same bran is that which follows: God would not *Truckle and Barter with the Devil and Sin for his Glory*. It's like he would not, but when the *Devil and Sin* had confederated against God, I know not why God might not *Over-reach* them in their *Designs*, and as he has made the *wrath of Man*, so he might also the *policy of Satan* to serve and praise Him; and thus he fixes a *New end upon sin*, which the Devil never dreamt on, or however did not design: But I perceive our Author is wondrously pleased with the fine Notion of *Trucking and Bartering*, and that we might not loose the beauty of it, he warns us amongst the *Errata*, (I would there were no worse) that for *Truckle*, we read *Truck*. Oh be sure (Courteous Readers) you do not mistake, for there's some weighty Controversie depends upon it, which the *Coffee-house*, and the *Inch of Candle* must determine. But further Nature teaches him, *That God had much rather be Glorious in the Happiness and Perfection and Obedience of his Creatures, than in their sin and misery*. Nature is an excellent School-Mistress I see, and this is one of her highest Mysteries, that God delights in Obedience more than Sin: But what now if Sin and Disobedience have got in? for my part I question whether Nature will teach him that God had rather, much rather, or however how much rather he had be more Glorious in exacting one

At-

Attribute than another; or whether God may not equally glorifie himself in the Execution of his just *Displeasure* against Sin obstinately pursued, as in the glorifying the Penitent and Reformed sinner; but this I know, that the former has more deserved *Eternal Punishment*, than the other can pretend to *desert Eternal Life*. But perhaps he has Ballances that will turn with the Twentieth part of a Grain, and in these he knows how to weigh which of Gods Attributes weigh heaviest: And that he can do, for he tells us, *That pardoning Mercy, and vindictive Justice are but secondary Attributes*: What warrant he has to marshal Gods Attributes in this order, I dare not enquire; which are *first rate*, which *second rate Attributes* is a Nice enquiry; but I expected a Dish of Coleworts before he had done, for these have been served up to us in the *Racovian Catechism*: Let these things be as they will, I observe, 1. That vindictive Justice, and pardoning Mercy are both equally Gods Attributes. 2. They are not the *less Essential* and *primary Attributes*, because they were not *Eternally* exercised, for then neither would Omnipotency be such: God was *Eternally Omnipotent* though he Created not the World from Eternity, and he was also *Eternally* a God of pardoning Mercy, and a God of punitive Justice, though to the Exerting the outward Acts proper to those Eternal excellencies there was required an Object capable of receiving them: This Nature and Scripture teaches us, and we are not much concern'd in our Authors *Theologie*; but to close up all, he gives us an Inference from his Doctrine, and a Reason of that Inference; His Doctrine was this: *Vindictive Justice, and Pardoning Mercy*

Mercy
His I
maril
is this
sign
is, G
he P
two
Stuff
[E
ment
the
in th
the
of g
Att
the
of
can
men
mie
ofte
step
con
of a
a R
teri
Ver
wh
and
eve
nor
Im
in

Mercy are not Primary but Secondary Attributes. His Inference is this: Therefore God cannot Primarily design the glorifying of them: His Reason is this: For that cannot be, without Primarily designing the sin, and misery of his Creatures. That is, God cannot Primarily design one thing, except he Primarily designs another; and so we shall have two Firsts, without a Second. This is very thin Stuff, it shines through.

[2.] The Reader has heard to his great Contentment, how admirably he has acquitted himself in the *Matter of sin*, if he can but play his part as well in the *Matter of our Righteousness*, he will deserve the *Whetstone*, and that may save him the *Labour of going to the Counter-door*. As it is with your *Artificial Fencers*, that never knew further than the *Discipline of the School*; they have all the *Terms of Art*, know their *Postures*, and with good *Credits* can play a *Prize* upon the *Stage*; yet when these men come to *Sharpe*, when the *Point of a real Enemies Sword* is ready prest at the heart, it puts them often out of their *forms*, their *School-play*, and *Systematical skill*: Thus possibly it may fare with our confident *Bravo's*, who can talk very confidently of appearing before God in their own *Duties*, and a *Righteousness* finely Composed out of those *Materials*, yet possibly their *Blood* may freeze in their *Veins*, and the *Colour* forsake their *bold Cheeks*, when God shews himself in his *glorious Majesty*, and they must be in a *moment*, as they must be for ever: None ever Ranted higher than *Bellarmine*, nor *Hector'd* the World with *Arguments* against *Imputed Righteousness*, yet when he saw *Death* was in good Earnest, he was glad to *Lower his Top-sail*, and

and cry out, *Precor ut inter sanctos suos, non assessor meritis, sed venia largitor me admittat*: And in his very *Rass* against that Doctrine, retreated to his *Tutissimum est, lib. 5. de justificatione*. What Doctor Owen asserts herein, is briefly thus much, *Com. page 113*. "All men are perswaded that God is a most Righteous God, *Hab. 1. 13*. and therefore the Ungodly cannot stand in the Judgment. Hence the enquiry of every one convinc'd of Immortality, and the Judgment to come is, concerning the Righteousness to appear before this Righteous God: The first thing that offers it self for Direction and Assistance is [*the Law*] which hath many fair Pleas to prevail with a Soul to close with it for a Righteousness: It was given out by God himself for that end, it contains the whole Obedience that God requires of the Sons of Men: It has the promise of Eternal Life annext to it: [*Do this and Live.*] But there are two things that discover the Vanity of seeking Righteousness in this Path, 1. That they have already sinned, and come short of the Glory of God, *Rom. 3. 23*. So that though they should for the time to come, fulfil the whole Law, yet there is a Score upon them already, they know not how to answer for. 2. That if former Debts were blotted out, yet they are no way able to fulfil the Law for the future; many other Devices men have found out, but in the Issue the matter comes to this. They look upon themselves, 1. As sinners obnoxious to the Law of God, and the Curse thereof, so that unless that be satisfied, it's in vain from thence to seek after an appearance before God. 2. As Creatures made to a Super-natural end, and therefore

"fore bound to answer the whole Mind and Will
 "of God. Now both these being beyond the Com-
 "pass of their own endeavours, it's their wisdom
 "to find out a Righteousness that may answer both
 "these to the utmost; now both these are to be
 "had only in the Lord Christ, who is our Righte-
 "ousness: Who, 1. Expiates former Iniquities:
 "2. Fulfills the whole Law by his active Obedience,
 "*Rom. 5. 10.* We are saved by his Life. And now
 the Doctor has told you the *short of his Story*: But
 our Author confutes him *much shorter*, and without
 Circumlocution replies: *This is a mighty comfortable*
Discovery, how we may be Righteous without doing
any thing that is good or Righteous. I'll warrant
 you a whole Cart-load of Books hath been Written
 of this Subject, all which with *Laconick Brevity*
 our Author has blown away with one Puff: And is
 not this a Compendious way of Dispatching Contro-
 versies out of the World? It is a Truth that *none is*
Righteous but he that doth righteousness, and as great
 a Truth, that *None is righteous before God*, because
he doth righteousness: Without Holiness no man
shall see God; and without *something more than his*
own holiness no man shall see God, or it were better
 he had never seen him. But more distinctly: 1. It's
 seasonable to enquire what is the Mind of the Church
 of *England* in this Matter, and She speaks freely,
Art. 11. We are accounted righteous before God,
only for the Merits of our Lord and Saviour Jesus
Christ; by Faith, and not for our own Works. Pray
 ask her then, Whether we may be Righteous with-
 out doing any thing that is Righteous, for which
 we are so accounted in the sight of God? And
 whereas he says with a Scoff, *This is a mighty com-*
P
fortable

comfortable Doctrine: The Church in that very Article determines in earnest: Wherefore that we are justified by Faith only, is a most wholesome Doctrine, and full of Comfort. Either then that Article Confutes his Assertion, or his Assertion confutes the Article. Again, Art. 13. Works done before the Grace of Christ, and the Inspiration of the Spirit, are not pleasant to God, forasmuch as they spring not of Faith in Christ. — And for that they are not done as God hath Commanded them to be done, no doubt but they have the Nature of sin. Hence it were easie to argue against our Author: Those works which are not pleasant to God, which have the Nature of sin, cannot justify the doer of them: But all works done before the Grace of Christ, the Inspiration of his Spirit, which spring not from Faith are such, therefore they cannot justify the doer of them before God. Either then we must never be justified, or else we must be justified without good Works, as that for which we are justified at least; though the Article would conclude something more. It's very uncomely to see ill taught Children to spit in their Mothers face; and we account that an evil Bird that defiles its own Nest. 2. It will be no less seasonable to enquire into the mind of the Spirit also: And the Apostle Paul seems to speak high, Rom. 4. 5. To him that worketh not, but believeth in him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness: And more modestly would become him than to quip the Apostle, and tell him This is a comfortable discovery how a man may be righteous, without doing any thing that is righteous. Again, In the business of Election, the Apostle argues thus, Rom. 11. 6. If it be by Grace, then

It is not of Works, otherwise Grace is no more Grace; but if it be of Works, then it is no more Grace, otherwise Work is no more Work. 3. It's seasonable to enquire whether our Author had not better have understood the Doctor better, before he had undertaken to answer him: For when he asserts that we are justified by Christ, he excludes not the way and means that God hath appointed to make the righteousness of Christ to become ours. He that saith we are justified by Christ, doth not deny we are justified by Faith, and therefore not without doing something that is good: Nay, he excludes not Inherent righteousness from the Soul, nor Gospel obedience from the Life, only he excludes them as too defective and imperfect to make us stand before God in the judgment. And herein he seems a more dutiful Son of the Church of England than our Author, let the 12th. Art. judge: *Albeit Works which are the fruits of Faith, and follow after Justification cannot put away our sins, and endure the severity of Gods judgment, yet are they pleasing and acceptable to God in Christ, and do spring out (necessarily) of a true and lively faith, insomuch that by them a lively faith may be as evidently known, as a Tree discerned by the fruit.* Whence it is obvious: That if our good Works, which are the fruits of Faith, which follow Justification, cannot endure the severity of Gods judgment, What shall become of those that are only the fruits of Nature, and go before Justification? Again, If those Works which are pleasing and acceptable to God in Christ, yet cannot endure the severity of Gods Judgment; Where then shall those appear, that being done before Justification, have the Nature of sin, and are not pleasant to God?

As the 13th. Art. determines; To whomsoever then this is *comfortable Doctrine*, I am sure it was *once so* to our Author, who by *Subscribing* these *very Doctrines*, got a *Living* of *very comfortable Importance*, and might have had the *Civility* with them of *Ephesus* to have owned; *By this Craft we get our Living*. But if our Author like not the *Doctors way*, let him prescribe *his own*, only let him be sure it be a *better, and safer way*; That he will: *The Scripture tells us expressly, he is righteous that doth righteousness, and without Holiness no man shall see God; that the only way to obtain the pardon of our sins is to repent of them, and forsake them, and the only thing that gives a right to the promises of Future glory, is to obey the Laws, and imitate the Example of our Saviour, and to be transformed into the Nature and Likeness of God.* We must crave his leave to take his words in pieces, that we may the better deal with them.

(1.) *The Gospel (says he) makes a different Representation of it, tells us expressly that he is righteous that doth righteousness.* But say I, This is *no representation of our justification different from what the Doctor has assigned.* And let the words be *Interpreted* how he will, they make nothing against the *Doctors assertions.* 1. Let these words [*He is Righteous*] signify [*He is Inherently righteous, or holy*] and then the plain Sense is; that he that doth *righteousness*, that *practises an Uniform, and Universal conformity in his Life to the Gospel*, may *charitably be judged by others*, and certainly known by *his own Conscience* to be such a one; as a *Tree is known by its fruits*: For so are we warranted by our Saviour to make a Judgment, *Mat.*

7. 16. And the same warrant we have from the Church of England: *Art. 12. --- Inſomuch that by them [good Works, that neceſſarily ſpring of a true and lively faith,] a lively Faith may be as evidently known, as a Tree diſcerned by the Fruit.* 2. Let the words be interpreted of *that Righteouſneſs by which, in which, and for which we ſtand accepted as Righteous before God*; yet it meets in the ſame point; he that from an honeſt and good heart brings forth holy Fruit, moſt certainly juſtified in the ſight of God, and is accepted of him; we may argue I hope (without Offence) *from the Effect to the Cauſe*, and yet the Cauſe and the Effect are *two things*. He that is ſanctified, is juſtified; and yet Sanctification is not Juſtification: we may ſafely conclude an *imputed Righteouſneſs* from an *imparted Righteouſneſs*, and yet that Righteouſneſs which we have *in Chriſt* may be another thing from that Righteouſneſs which we have by influence from Chriſt, as our Head.

(2.) Sayes he, The Goſpel tells us, that *without Holineſs no man ſhall ſee God*. It does ſo indeed; but does it tell us, that *Holineſs* is inconfiſtent with our *Juſtification by the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt*? Or does it tell us, that upon the account of *our own Holineſs*, we ſhall be *juſtified before God*?

(3.) *The onely way to obtain the Pardon of Sins, is to repent of them, and forſake them.* That without Repentance there's no poſſibility of obtaining Pardon of Sin, we freely grant; they muſt be *Sinners* that need a Pardon, and they muſt be *penitent Sinners* that are qualified to receive one: The Goſpel has annex'd by expreſs Promise the Pardon of Sin to Repentance. *1 Joh. 1. 9. If we confeſs our ſins, he is faithfull and juſt to forgive us our ſins,*

and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness. But what an absurd way of procedure is this, to jumble and confound things together, which ought to have their several Apartments, and distinct Interests allotted to them in one and the same Effect: The Grace of God as the great Spring and Fountain of all Mercy, must have a place in the Pardon of a Sinner; and the blood of Jesus Christ, as the Meritorious Cause, justly challenges a great room therein. Eph. 1. 7. In whom we have redemption through his blood, even the remission of sins, according to the riches of his grace; and Faith in our Lord Jesus Christ, will come in for a share too, as it gives us an Interest in what he has suffered by way of Atonement to God, and Expiation of our sins; and godly sorrow for, hatred of, and turning from sin in Purpose and Resolution, at least must have its proper Concern therein too: But to assert, that Repentance is the onely way of procuring Pardon, excluding Faith, and the Propitiation made in the Blood of Christ, needs more grains of Allowance than he will afford to any he deals with, to make it justifiable. But the vanity of this Fallacy lyes in this; That he opposes the Righteousness of Christ, and the Means whereby it's applyed to our Persons: As if one would stiffly contend that we are justified by Faith alone, and therefore not by the Righteousness of Christ; whereas we are therefore justified by Faith, because we are justified by Christ; we are justified by the Righteousness of Christ alone, as that which God onely considers in the Justification of a Sinner, to answer his Law, his Justice; and we are justified by Faith alone, as that which makes Christ ours. Say the same here: Repentance is a Means

to qualify us for the receiving the pardon of Sin, God will never give forth a Pardon to that Sinner that is not brought upon his knees, throughly humbled for his Transgressions, yet still that which God respects in the pardon of a Sinner, is the Blood of his Son; without shedding of which, there is not, there cannot be any Remission, Hebr. 9. 22. But no man shall perswade our Author to distinguish betwixt Christs procurement of so great a Mercy, and the Way of the Gospel appointment for the Applying it to our selves.

(4.) The onely thing that gives us a right to the Promises of future Glory, is to obey the Laws, and imitate the Example of our Saviour, and to be transformed into the Nature and Likeness of God. For my part, I conceive far otherwise; That though our Holiness give us a Meekness and Finesse to partake of the Inheritance of the Saints in light, yet it was the Lord Jesus Christ that procured our right and title to it, and the Promise of it. The Church of England was of the same Opinion, when it decreed, Art. 13. That works done before the Grace of Christ, and the Inspiration of the Spirit, are not pleasant to God, neither do they make man meet to receive Grace, &c. And then we may presume, will not make us meet to receive Glory, much less give us a right and title to the Promises of it: And Art. 12. That the works which follow after Justification, are those that are pleasing and acceptable to God; and I think we may equally take it for granted, that upon our justification with God, we have a right to the Promises of future Glory: But, if this be true, that the onely thing that gives us this right, be Obedience to, Imitation of Christ, and Conformity

fornicity to the Nature of God; we may have a Right to, when we have actual Possession of Glory; for till then, it will hardly be true, that we have obeyed all Christs Laws.

But our Author had Wit in his Anger, and was aware of an Objection that was coming againit him, and wisely layes in for it as well as he could. It might be returned to all that he had said, How can *so imperfect an Obedience* as ours is, *so every wayes lame and defective*, and short of the *exact Law of God*, ever give us a right to the Promises of future Glory? Yes, (sayes he) *for though it be not exact, and perfect in every thing, yet if it be sincere, we shall be accepted for the sake of Christ, by vertue of the Covenant that he hath Sealed with his Blood*; But I am afraid, he has conjured up a Spirit that he cannot lay again with so sorry a Charm. For, (1.) I do not find that God has abated any thing of his Law, but is as peremptory as ever; for, [*Do this and live,*] Nothing will please God less than exact and perfect Obedience, though *in the Covenant of Grace* he is pleased to admit Another, a Mediator to doe it for Believers. I had rather he would hear the Reverend and Learned Bishop Reynolds, upon Psal. 115. p. 492. *In point of Validity or Invalidity, there can be but Five things said of the Law*: 1. *Either it must be Obedyed, and that it is not*; for, all have sinn'd, and come short of the Glory of God, Rom. 3. 23. Or, 2. *it must be Executed upon Men, and the Curse and Penalty thereof inflicted, and that it is not neither*; for, there is no Condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus, Rom. 8. 1. Or, 3. *it must be Abrogated or extinguish'd, and that it is not neither*; for, Heaven and Earth

Earth
there-
the L
be no
the L
vably
canno
ittle
rema
must
dispe
ied,
there
ling
doe a
the
shoul
wor
of th
reco
Sinc
the C
and
lent
fear
a C
Dut
ver
will
nor
less
the
will
Sim

Earth shall sooner pass away. If there were no Law, there would be no Sin, for sin is the Transgression of the Law: And if there were no Law, there would be no Judgement, for the World must be judged by the Law: Or, 4. it must be Moderated, and favourably interpreted by Rules of Equity, and that it cannot be neither; for it's inflexible, and one jot or tittle must not be abated. Or, lastly, the Law is self remaining, the Obligation thereof notwithstanding, must, towards such or such Persons, be so far forth dispensed withall, as that a Surety shall be admitted, (upon a Concurrence of all their Wills who are therein interested; God willing to Allow, Christ willing to Perform, Man willing to Enjoy,) both to doe all the Duties, and to suffer all the Curses of the Law, in behalf of that Person, who in Rigor should have done or suffer'd all, so that the Law, nor one jot or tittle thereof is abrogated in regard of the Obligation therein contained, but they are all reconciled in Christ. Thus far he. But, (2.) That Sincerity which he talks of, is indeed allow'd in the Gospel, in the Matter of Inherent Righteousness and Sanctification, there it has a proper and excellent place, but comes not into the business of Justification at all: And (3.) This Sincerity will be but a Cover-*slut* for the Omission and Neglect of our Duty; for if Sincerity will do the work without Universality and Integrity of Obedience, the best way will be to shrowd our selves under a profound Ignorance of Gods Commandments, and then the less we know of Gods Will, the safer we are under the shelter of Sincerity. And, (4.) The Question will be, How much shortness of Obedience will this Sincerity compound for? It may be our Author will prescribe

prescribe a *Drachm* of Sincerity to a *Scruple* of Disobedience, but then Another will make a *Grain* of Sincerity, a very little upon a *knifes point*, serve to sweeten a whole *Pound* of Defect in Duty; and thus every Mountebank, with a dose of his *Electuary* of Sincerity, will pretend to heal mens Consciences of those wounds that Sin has given them. (5.) Where, as our Author adds, that we shall be accepted for the sake of Christ, it's a meer Juggle; for when he comes to enquire, What Influence the Righteousness and Death of Christ have upon our acceptation with God; he professes he can find nothing in the world, but that God will pardon us, if we believe and obey the Gospel, p. 320. which doubtless he would have done without him: But this is onely to make the same use of Christ, that Politicians doe of the *Foxes Case*, to piece the *Lions skin* when it's too short; just so must Christ serve to ke out the shortness of their Obedience with his own, and when they have stretcht their own Righteousness upon the Tenters as far as it will hold, to be beholden to Christ for the Rest: God for Christs sake does indeed accept our imperfect Duty, Obedience, Service, and pardon the shortness of it, according to the Tenour of the Covenant of Grace, but not that it should thereby stand for our Justification, which we have onely upon the Account of what he has done and suffered for us, made ours by accepting him upon his own Terms.

(3.) We are come with much adoe to the third and last Addition, that these men make, or are supposed to make to the Gospel, Viz. Concerning our Wisdom to walk with God. To which (thinks Doctor Owen,) there is required Agreement, Acquaintance,

Way, Strength, Boldness, and aiming at the same End, and all these, with the Wisdom of them, are hid in the Lord Jesus. It were worth the while to transcribe the Doctors discourse upon all these Heads, but our Author has saved me the Labour; The summe of all is this: That Christ having expiated our sins, and fulfilled all Righteousness for us, though we have no Personal Righteousness of our own, but are as contrary to God as Darkness is to Light, and Death to Life, and an universal Pollution and Defilement, to an universal and glorious Holiness, and Hatred to Love; yet the Righteousness of Christ is a sufficient, nay the onely Foundation of our Agreement, and (upon that) of our walking with God. Now without doubt our Author would have his Reader believe, that the Doctor has said all this, and that he intends we may have Communion with God, whilest we continue thus: I confess, at the reading hereof, I was amazed, knew not what to think. Have I been all this while so narrowly watching the Doctor, that a false Print, much less a false Doctrine, could not escape me, and is our Author come after me, and findes all this filth and abominable stuffe? Once again therefore (because I durst not trust my own Eyes or Ears, and am under a Vow never to trust our Authors Tongue or Pen, speaking evil of the Doctor,) I took down the Book, and what I find I will transcribe, and let all the world judge. *Com. p. 119.* "The Prophet tells us, that two cannot walk together unless they be agreed, *Amos 3. 3.* Untill Agreement be made, there is no Communion; God and Man by Nature, (or whilest Man is in the state of Nature) are at the greatest Enmity; He declares nothing

"to

"to us but wrath; neither do we come short of him,
 "yea we first began it, and continue longest in it.
 "In this state, the wisdom of walking with God,
 "must needs be most remote from the Soul; He is
 "Light, and in him is no Darknes at all; we are
 "Darknes, and in us is no Light at all; he is Life,
 "a living God; we are dead Sinners, dead in Tref-
 "passes and sins; he is Holiness, and glorious in it;
 "we wholly defiled, and an abominable thing; he
 "is Love, we Hatred, hating and being hated;
 "Surely, this is no Foundation for Agreement, or
 "(upon that) of Walking with God; Nothing can be
 "more remote than this Frame from such a Con-
 "dition. Let now the Reader (and it's no great
 matter whether he be ingenuous or disingenuous,
 partial or impartial) compare what the Doctor has
 written, with what is fixt upon him: The Doctor
 sayes, *Whilest we are such and such, we can have
 no Communion with God, cannot walk with him.*
 Nay (says our Author) the Doctor sayes the clean
 contrary; that *though we are as contrary to God as
 Light is to Darknes, &c. yet the Righteousness of
 Christ is a sufficient Foundation for Agreement:* So
 again, p. 121, 122. Com. *There must be moreover
 a Way wherein we must walk with God; and Christ
 is that way, Isa. 35. 8. an High-way, a Way of Ho-
 linefs.* No (sayes our Author) *though we be as
 contrary to God, as universal Pollution to universal
 Holiness, yet the Righteousness of Christ is a suffi-
 cient Foundation, &c. As the Doctor sayes.* The
 Error then of the Doctor being so gross, the Con-
 futation must needs be as easie; for I observe, our
 Author is very kind to himself, and will not set
 himself a hard Task: One Text will easily doe it;

1 John

John 1. 6, 7. *If we say, we have fellowship with him, and walk in darkness; we lye, and do not the Truth: but if we walk in the light, as God is in the light, then have we fellowship one with another, and [then] the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanse us from all sins.* Where he has fallaciously toysted in a little word [then] though somewhat bigger than the Doctors [by] to seduce the unwary Reader into a Conceit; then *when we have walk'd in the light as God is in the light, for some competent time, at last we shall have some benefit by the blood of Christ to cleanse us from sin.* And now he falls to please himself in his old Humour of either ignorantly mistaking, or maliciously abusing the Doctors words: *Our onely acquaintance with God, and knowledge of him, is hid in Christ, which his Word and Works could not discover, as you heard above:* It is very true, we have heard our Author bespatter him thus above, and shall do so again beneath, before, and behind, on the right hand, and the left; but that the Doctor ever spoke a syllable that opposes the Person of Christ, and the Revelations of the Gospel; that he supposes any Mysteries learnt from an Acquaintance with Christs Person, wherein the Gospel is deeply silent, is a shameless Falshood; which because we would give it a more gentle Name than it deserves, may be called a *Shertocisme*.

One blow more he must give the Doctor for a parting blow, and then he will give us leave to take a little breath. The Doctor it seems had said; *That in Christ we design the same End that God doth; which is, the Advancement of his Glory.* And is he a Christian that denyes it? Ought not all that wear the Livery of a Redeemer, to pursue the great End

of

of Advancing Gods glory? If the Doctor had affirmed twice Two to make Four, our Author is bound in Conscience to deny it; but is there never a Paraphrase that may dress them up in some ugly hew? O yes, one of his *idests* will do the feat: *That is*, (sayes he) *by trusting to the Expiation and Righteousness of Christ for salvation, without doing any thing our selves, we take care that God shall not be robbed of the Glory of his Free-grace, by a Competition of any Merits, and Deserts of our own.* That little policy there is in these words, lyes in that short Parenthesis, which with more cunning than honesty he has wedg'd into his own gloss, [*Without doing any thing our selves.*] But where, when, in what Book, Chapter, Section, Page, or Paragraph, has the Doctor encouraged any to look for salvation by Christ, without doing anything our selves? Cannot we design the Glory of God, trusting to the Expiation and Righteousness of Christ, but all Obedience must presently be excluded? And yet his Parenthesis is capable of a double sence: 1. As excluding Obedience simply and absolutely, and so they are none of the Doctors words, but a crafty Insinuation of our Authors, to mislead us into this Opinion, that the Doctor has quite cashiered Obedience from having any place in our Salvation; a thing so abhorred by all his Principles, so contrary to all his Writings, that nothing could have been either more unjustly forged against, or basely fixed upon him: 2. They may be construed as excluding Obedience in some respects, for some Ends and Purposes; and thus though the Doctor has not said it in that place, yet I suppose he will say it, and maintain it when he has done: That Believers may, and ought to expect

Salvation from the *Expiation*, and *Righteousness of Christ*, without doing anything themselves, for those special and particular ends for which Christ suffered. — We do nothing (in Comparison of our Duty and those Obligations that are laid upon us) yet whatsoever we do, 'tis not to satisfy Gods Justice, to appease his Anger, to justify our selves, to Purchase and Merit eternal Life: And hereby God has taken Care that he be not Robb'd of the Glory of his Free-grace, nor Christ of the Glory of his Sufferings, by a Competition of any Merits, and Deserts of our own: And let all the Sons of Men take Care also at their utmost Peril how they do it.

Some men, I see, are wonderfully pleased with their own unsavoury *Evocations*, though they offend their Neighbours with their *Onions* and *Garlick*; and accordingly our Author is so highly taken with his own Crudities, and undigested Notions, that he is resolved to give us them over again in a *Scheme of Religion*; (for this is all the Mode, since Systematical Divinity grew out of Fashion, and that some do begin to affect the Title of *Schematized Divines*;) In which admirable Product of his Wit and Phancy, he brings nothing New, his Rayling faculty like an old *Skrub-broom*, being worn to the *Stumps*, and offers as little *Proof* as *Noverty*, and therefore *gratis Negatum* might serve for an answer to *gratis Dictum*; yet that he may not Complain that we Overlook his Excellencies, I shall Sprinkle a few soft Drops upon him as he goes along.

1. In the entrance of his Scheme, he stumbles at the same Block he once broke his Shins at; supposing these men to assert: That God appointed and

ordained sin for the glory of his Vindictive Justice, and Pardoning Grace. A Charge so Idle, Vain, and False, that nothing can attoné, but his pleading *invincible Ignorance*: God did not appoint and ordain *sin*, that he might glorifie his Mercy and Justice thereby, but upon Supposition that sin had been Introduced, he Over-rules it, he appoints it to another End, orders it to another Purpose, than in its own Nature it could ever have reacht. And this the Doctor calls *Putting a New end to sin*, p. 106. And was God ever denied the Liberty, before t'other day, to bring Good out of Evil?

2. He lays it down as their Doctrine: *It pleased God that man should sin, but when he hath sinned He is displeased with it.* This seems to be a piece of Wit, designed to make the Devil Merry; but all the Humour of it lies in the Ambiguity of one poor word. *It pleased God to permit sin*, and yet when man had sinned he was justly displeased with it. Gods permission had no Influence upon mans Transgression. But how would he have Insulted over that man that should openly Preach and Write: *That against the Holy Child Jesus, whom God anointed, both Herod, and Pontius Pilate, and the People of Israel were gathered together for to do whatsoever Gods Hand, and Gods Counsel determined before so be done*, and yet when it was done according to the Determination of his own Hand and Counsel, he was extreemly displeased with it? And yet I could tell him of one that has so said, who Scorns his most scornful Censure: It may please God that a thing may be done, and take no pleasure in the thing done, nor in the Instruments that did it. *It pleased him to suffer his own People to be afflicted by the Hea-*
then

then, and yet he was sore displeased with the Hea-
 then that helped forward the Affliction, Zech. 1. 15.
 It pleased the Father to bruise his Son, and yet he
 was displeased with the Instruments that bruised
 him: God can do the same thing Righteously, which
 Men and Devils do unrighteously. Judas delivered
 up Christ out of Covetousness, the Jews out of
 Envie, Pilate out of Fear, or to pick a Thank from
 Caesar, but God Delivered him for our Offences.

3. He charges them with this Doctrine: That
 nothing can withstand the Decrees of God. We have
 scarce another Instance wherein he has Candidly
 represented their Judgment, and was not able to
 throw some Dirt upon it.

4. He proceeds to play the Lucian, and Scoff at
 Gods Justice; *It's impossible* (says he) *for God to*
forgive the least sin without a compleat and perfect
Satisfaction: Let him but grant that God cannot for-
 give the greatest sin without compleat and perfect
 Satisfaction, and they will undertake to prove
 from thence, that none is so small but needs a Sa-
 tisfaction.

5. He proceeds: This falls hard upon those mi-
 serable Wretches, whose ill fortune it was to be left
 out of the Roll of Election, without any fault of
 theirs: To be left out of the Roll of Election by
 Fortune, is a piece of prophane Nonsense, which
 at once discovers the depth of his Intellectuals, and
 the height of his Boldness. What more Desultory,
 than that which Heathens call Fortune? What more
 stable and fixed, than that which the Word of
 God calls Election? The Old Church of England
 would have Taught him to have Spoken otherwise
 of that Tremendous Myserie. Art. 17. *Election*

on to Life is the everlasting purpose of God, whereby, before the Foundation of the World was laid, He hath constantly Decreed by his Counsel secret to us, to deliver from Curse and Damnation, those whom He hath chosen in Christ out of Mankind, and to bring them by Christ to everlasting Salvation, &c. Now though he believes little of all this, yet he might remember he had *Subscribed the whole*, and considered also tis the Doctrine of *that Church* whereof he is a *Member*, and therefore might have Covered their Nakedness, and at least Perfum'd them with a few good Cheap words against their Burial: It were tedious to pursue the particulars, I only say: If this Scheme of Religion as it stands here upon Record, be the *Subject of his Scorn and Reproach*, I hope we may read it backwards, and then 'twill be *his own Creed*; some few Slanders indeed which were inserted as a *Haut-goust*, to give it the better Grace, we may Omit, but for the rest no doubt he will own it to be *the Standard of his Belief*.

"God from the Beginning never Designed to
 "Glorifie either his Justice, or Mercy, and because
 "there would have been Occasion abundantly Ad-
 "ministred both to Punish and Pardon too, though
 "man had never sinned, therefore he never con-
 "cern'd himself how things would go. And indeed
 "it had been to no purpose, for God to Decree
 "any thing, since if he had, all his Decrees, and
 "Appointments had been easily withstood: And
 "therefore man sinned whether God would or no,
 "and full sore against his Will; for if he could
 "have prevented it, we may be sure he would;
 "but when man had sinned God was not much dis-
 "pleased

"pleased with it, for you must know that his Justice
 "is *so Facile*, and *Easie* an *Attribute* (and if it be
 "one at all, it's but a *Secondary one*) that he can
 "easily forgive the greatest sin without Satisfaction
 "made to it. This is very good News [if it be
 "true] to all the World, especially seeing there's
 "no such thing as the *Roll of Election*, and by Con-
 "sequence no *preterition* neither, but all men stand
 "upon even Ground, and every one upon his own
 "Legs, which they may the better do because they
 "have many ways left (if need were) to pacifie
 "Gods anger, in case he should happen to be a little
 "displeased with sin, viz. By their own Temporal
 "sufferings, Repentance, and Obedience, which
 "though they answer not Gods Law, yet being sin-
 "cere, its well enough: By this it appears that God
 "is not *Essentially* Just and Righteous, seeing He
 "can Pardon the greatest sin, and serve his own
 "Glory, without any regard to the Death of Christ,
 "or Inflicting upon sinners Eternal Sufferings. But
 "now this is but one part of the Glory of God, that
 "He can pardon sin without Propitiation made by
 "Christ, the other is that he can reward the sinner
 "too, without the *Righteousness* of Christ: And
 "therefore there's more ado than needs about a
 "pretended Difficulty how to Reconcile Gods Ju-
 "stice and Mercy: For neither is Justice so severe
 "as to require Satisfaction, and the Merit of our
 "own Obedience is so Considerable, that we need
 "not much be beholden to Mercy. And to speak in
 "a word, the Demerit of sin is short of Infinite,
 "and therefore the Creature may Expiate its own
 "sins by enduring Finite, that is Temporary Tor-
 "ments; whereas then men Talk that so Unite
 "these

" these two Extrems, and reconcile such Contra-
 " dictions was a work of Infinite Wisdome, as well
 " as Goodness; they Talk Idly; for (as I said be-
 " fore) whatever there was of Goodness in it, there
 " could be no great Wisdom; and therefore it's vain-
 " ly said, that to Effect it God should send his Son
 " into the World to satisfie all Righteousness in his
 " Life, and to make a full satisfaction for sin by
 " his Death; for neither could his Blood be of In-
 " finite value (though for Fashion sake, we call it
 " the Blood of the Son of God) nor Expiate an In-
 " finite guilt, or make satisfaction to Gods Justice
 " (if so be he had stood upon't:) And therefore
 " to Instruct you aright in these Matters, sin had
 " no such Infinite guilt in't as Christians speak of,
 " nor did Gods Justice exact such Satisfaction: For
 " he is more Glorified by Conniving at, and Indul-
 " ging of sin, at cheap Rates, (for the Naturalness
 " of Gods Justice to him is a Position to be abhor-
 " red) without any Security given, or Compensa-
 " tion made to it; that is, he is so Merciful that
 " whereas sin may possibly have some Grains of
 " Evil in it, yet in God there are not only Drams,
 " but Ounces of such Mercy which he will freely
 " dispense, without regarding what becomes of his
 " other Attributes; which you will confess to be a
 " glorious kind of Mercy, and such, as Impenitent
 " sinners cannot wish for a better. And since as I
 " have often said, and must Inculcate it again, the
 " Justice and Vengeance of God (if they should
 " prove more than Names) yet require no Consid-
 " eration to be had of them, but that their Claims
 " may be easily waived or slighted, or slubber'd over
 " by general Mercy without reference to Christ,
 " his

"his Death or Sufferings, and God can Pardon as
 "many and as great sins as He pleases, without fear
 "of being reputed a Remiss Governor: Hereupon
 "a most glorious and comfortable Scene of Affairs
 "appears to sinners, for now God can embrace sin-
 "ners as a kind Father, and account them Righte-
 "ous without any Adoption through Christ; nay,
 "as we told you above, though Christ had never
 "appeared in the World. And this is enough in all
 "Reason to make sinners Transported with Joy:
 "But yet I have better News than this; For as God
 "never required that his Justice should be satisfied,
 "so he is not so Punctual and Strict that his Laws
 "should be Obeyed: For if we be but Innocent
 "once by Pardon, what's matter for a Righteousness
 "by keeping the Law (or any other way) to make
 "us accepted with God, for the former will deliver
 "us from Hell, and that's all that we need care for?
 "But indeed you cannot well conceive what 'tis to
 "be Pardoned, but must presently be flush'd up with
 "a Conceit of Eternal reward. There is one thing
 "I would acquaint you with, but 'tis a great Se-
 "cret: If Christ has Satisfied at all, its for sins of
 "Omission, as well as Commission; that is, though
 "we never Repent, Believe, Turn from sin to God,
 "yet if there be any thing at all in't, I'm inclin'd
 "to this, that the very Neglect of the Terms
 "of the Covenant, shall not hurt us; but
 "we may be Reputed by God to have done all, and
 "never regarded to keep any: And now God, and
 "sinners may very well agree together (for though
 "Communion be an ill favoured word, yet I allow
 "they may converse) For what should hinder them?
 "Original sin they have none, and for Actual sin,

"there's no such *Demerit* in it as should necessarily
 "enforce Gods Justice to Insist upon a *Reparation*
 "of its Honour, and therefore let none trouble
 "themselves with those *Mormo's*, some have made
 "of Justice to affright Children; nor on the other
 "hand make such a doe to be clothed with the white
 "and spotless Robes of Christs Righteousness; for
 "though I cannot deny God to be Holy, yet his
 "Justice sleeps like a Sword of State in a Velvet
 "Scabbard. Let all therefore set their hearts at
 "rest; do but repent as well as you can, and you shall
 "be Saved with a notwithstanding Gods Justice, and
 "notwithstanding you have no Interest in the Satisfac-
 "tion of Christ.

These may reasonably be supposed some of our
 Authors Fundamental Doctrines, seeing he so ve-
 hemently Persecutes their Contraries, which for
 Distinction-sake, may well be called, *The Religion*
of his own itching Noddle.

Our Author had promised us a Discovery of what
 Additions some men had made to the Gospel; and he
 has now saved his Recognizance, and shew'd him-
 self Master of his word, at as wild a Rate as ever
 was Indited from *Bedlam*. There is but one thing
 more calls for his Abilities, and that is to Render the
 Practice of it as ridiculous as he has done the Prin-
 ciples, and then perhaps we may obtain a short Ces-
 sation from this hot Service. Now the Practice
 hereof (he says) consists in accepting of Christ,
 and coming to Him, and applying his Merits, and
 Satisfaction and Righteousness to our selves for Par-
 don, and Justification, and in those Duties which
 are consequent upon such an Union and closure with
 Christ. And is it possible that these things should
 hear

hear ill with them who would pass for Christians? Or must we Renounce the Scriptures to Gratifie a few Raving Men, who are fallen out with all the World and their own Understandings? *Accepting of Christ* must be Reviled; and yet to this are we directed, that we may become the Sons of God, *John 1. 12. As many as received him, to them he gave power to become the Sons of God. Coming to Christ*, must be loaded with Scorn; and yet our Saviour has expressly encouraged *All that labour, and are heavy laden, to come to him that he may give them rest*, Mat. 11. 28. If these Phrases be not rightly understood, let us be Instructed in the Spirit of Meekness; but by no means let the very Expressions of Scripture, be the Theam for every conceited Buffoon to exercise his Railing Faculties upon. The first thing that offers it self, is a gross Self-contradiction: For whereas he had Confessed, that *The Practice of these mens Religion consists in accepting of Christ, &c.* And in those Duties which are consequent upon such an Union, and closure with Christ; yet in the very next words, before he had finisht his Period, or made a Pause, he represents it thus. "Christ having satisfied for our sins, it's
 "a plain and necessary Consequence that we have
 "nothing to do, but to get an Interest in the Satisfaction and Righteousness of Christ, that they may
 "be Imputed to us; for he is very Ignorant of
 "Christ, that hopes any thing else will avail him to
 "Salvation. Nothing to do? Yes: We have those consequential Duties to do; which follow upon our Union and closing with Christ. Nothing to do? Why, we have enough to do for Time and Eternity; enough to fill up every corner of our Hearts, every

Moment of our Time, with Service, and Obedience to Him who hath Reconciled us to God, by the Blood of his Cross: If Malice were not sometimes blind, there would be no Living by it in the World. Now (says he) that we may thus come to Christ, its absolutely necessary that we be sensible of our Lost and Undone condition. And dares he prescribe it as a safer way to keep up an Insensibility of it? A senseless regard to our Sin, and Misery thereupon, is no very hopeful way to put a sinner upon a serious enquiry after the proper Remedy: I wish we were sure of our Authors Thoughts herein, and whether he does indeed own that All men are by Nature in such a Lost and Undone condition. The Church of Englands Thoughts are Evident, Art. 9. [Of Original, or Birth-sin:] Original sin standeth not in the following of Adam (as the Pelagians vainly talk) but it is the corruption of the Nature of every Man, whereby Man is very far gone from Original Righteousness, and is inclined to Evil. — So that in every Person born into the World, it deserveth Gods Wrath and Damnation. Surely here's something that deserves our most serious Thoughts: That which deserves Damnation at Gods Hands, deserves consideration at ours. He that can carry about with him daily a depraved Nature, enclined to evil, running counter to Gods Will, and not lament it with a bitter Lamentation, has taken some of our Authors Hypnoticks; and how to bewail it without being sensible of it, is a Mysterie perhaps as deep as any of those we owe to his Discovery. And is not this to Reproach Christ himself? Mat. 9. 12, 13. They that be whole have no need of the Physician, but they that are sick:

Ay

Ay (them
Wel
1ap
I co
pent
will
Rep
Prac
abso
poss
have
the s
be n
our
aga
very
tiny
tlen
wist
not
fles
abo
the
Chr
"A
"g
"t
"T
"a
"L
"I
thi
Pe

Ay (says he) these are *Metaphors*, and I will Rail
 them out of *Credit and Countenance* immediately.
 Well, you shall not fall out with Christ for a *Me-*
taphor, if I can help it: Read the Next words;
I come not to call the Righteous, but Sinners to Re-
pentance: And they must be *sensible sinners* that
 will regard the *Call of Christ*, or think they need
Repentance. Another Quarrel he has against the
 Practice of their Religion, is: That they hold it
 absolutely necessary, that we be sensible how *Im-*
possible it is for us to Atone the Wrath of God, to
 have any *righteousness of our own*, that can bear
 the severe *Scrutiny of his Justice*. Be it so, if there
 be no Remedy; It seems then if we could work up
 our *Imagination* into a *Presumption*, that *Gods Anger*
 against *sin* is very small, and our *Righteousness*
 very great, so great as to endure the severe *Scr-*
utiny of Gods Justice, we might purchase this *Gen-*
tlemans favour: But the Gospel has taught us other-
 wise, *Rom. 3. 10.* That *there is none righteous, no*
not one: That *by the deeds of the Law, shall no*
flesh be justified in Gods sight, ver. 20. But he lays
 about him, and Reproaches the *Spirit of Bondage*,
 the *Spirit of Adoption*, and at last falls a Reviling
Christs own Words. "We shall (says he in his
 'fleeing way) never Value, and Prize Christ, and
 "go to him for Salvation, till we are Convinc'd of
 "the necessity of him, and driven to him by the
 "Threatnings of the Law; and the Promise of Ease
 "and Rest is made only to the weary and heavy
 "Laden, and those only shall be satisfied, who
 "Hunger and Thirst after Righteousness. Really,
 this Doctor Owen, and his Fellows, are dangerous
 Persons, I wonder not now that some think it not
 fit

fit they should live a day; That ever they should be so bold to read, or quote *Matth. 5. 6. Blessed are they that hunger and thirst after Righteousness, for they shall be filled;* or that other place, *Matth. 11. 28. Come unto me all you that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest;* or to mention, *Galat. 3. 24. Wherefore the Law was our School-master to bring us unto Christ:* But did they make the Scriptures? or coin, and invent these words of their own heads? or has our Author a *License* to expose the Expressions of the Holy Spirit, as well as the Doctors? Surely, an awfull regard to the Authority of Jesus Christ speaking in them, might have commanded some Reverence to them, and controlled this unbridled liberty of prostituting Sacred Matters. But thus much, and too much of what they make of Conviction. And now (says he) being thus stung with Sin, it is time for us to look up to Christ, as the Israelites did on the Brazen Serpent that we may be healed: But is this Gentleman indeed a Minister, a Teacher of others, the Rector of St. George Buttolphs-lane, and knows not that he reproaches Christ himself? *Joh. 3. 15. And as Moses lifted up the Serpent in the Wilderness, even so must the Son of Man be lifted up, that whosoever believeth in him, should not perish, but have Eternal Life:* And does not Christ himself authorize the Parallel? That as none were healed in the Wilderness, but those onely who sensible of pain, looked up to the Brazen Serpent, as Gods own Institution, to which a Promise of healing was annexed; so neither can we receive any benefit by Christ, till under a deep sense of our sin and misery, we accept of, and close with a Redeemer, whom the Father has held forth to be a Pro-

Propitiation, through Faith in his Blood, for the Remission of sins. But this is not all: Now we must begin to see his fulness, and perfection, and suitability to the wants and necessities of our Souls, that he is our Attonement, our Wisdom, our Righteousness, and all that we can desire or need. Well; and if they do conceive Christ to have both fulness and suitability of all Grace and Mercy in him, I hope it's neither Felony nor Treason neither: We have an Assurance, Heb. 4. 15. That Christ is such a Priest as is touched with a feeling of our Infirmities, and was in all points tempted like unto us, yet without sin; (there's great suitability,) and we are encouraged to come boldly to the throne of Grace, that we may obtain Mercy, and find Grace to help in time of need, (and there's fulness): And surely our Author does sometimes pray to Christ, (at least he is enjoin'd by the Litany to say,) O God the Son, Redeemer of the World, have mercy upon us miserable Sinners: Now if he can indeed discover no suitability, no fulness of Grace in Christ, to answer the needs and wants of those miserable Sinners, he had better save his Breath to cool his Pottage.

It is further charged upon them, That when the sense of their sins and unworthiness makes them afraid to come to Christ, they have recourse to their Acquaintance with Christs Person, to answer their Doubts, and quiet their Consciences. Which charge (though it has a Tincture and dash of our Authors good Nature in it) they can easily bear, and do confess, that when the sense of their sins, and Unworthiness, at any time discourages them from Coming to God for the Pardon of sins, they do relieve themselves from the Gospel, which has spoken great things

things of the Ability, and Readiness of a Mediator, to save humble and repenting Sinners, that are willing to receive him as God has offer'd him in the Covenant of Grace; They do there find that *Christ came into the World, to save the chiefest of Sinners*, such as had been *Blasphemers, Persecutors, and Injurious*, and yet have obtained *Mercy*, that *Christ in them might shew forth all long-suffering, for a Pattern to them that should afterwards believe on him to Everlasting Life*, 1 Tim. 1. 15, 16, 17. And do further believe, that to deny this, is at once to renounce the whole Gospel; and if it be not a Fruit of down-right Infidelity and Atheisme, yet most apparently leads thither.

Our Author having *destroy'd the Living*, begins to prey upon the Dead; and has therefore raked Mr. Shepheard out of his Grave, to shew us that he has some skill in Necromancy: We read of one that had his dwelling amongst the Tombs, possess'd with an unclean Spirit, but so outrageous that none could tame him, no Chains would hold him, so fierce that none durst pass by the way: And as I remember, Q. Currius, tells us of the Hyena, That her great delight is to dig up Carcasses, and insult over them; And what was the Character of a great Prince, that he never spared Man in his Anger, nor Woman in his Lust; may be accommodated to him whose Ambition would Triumph over the quick and the dead. I know well, that a few of our Authors Squibs and Crackers will pass for a Confutation of the clearest Truth, with them who are of the same distemper'd Spleen with himself; but with those holy and pious Souls, to whose Conversion, Consolation and Establishment in the Gospel, God has blessed the Labours of that

that worthy Person, their Repute is not to be shaken by the feeble Attempts of grinning Malice and Envy, whose onely Reason for their hatred of things excellent, is because they are Excellent.

I think there cannot a more proper defence of wronged Innocency be found out, than to repeat the foul-mouth'd language of Detraction: Hear therefore what our Author sayes. *The Reason of all this is very plain from our Acquaintance with Christ, for he is our Physician, and therefore we must not think of healing our selves, but must goe to him with all our diseases and sores about us, that he Alone may have the Honour of healing us. Mock on: He is a Fountain set open for sin and for uncleanness, and therefore we must goe to him with all our Filthiness, to be cleansed and washed; for if we be first clean, there's no need of a Fountain. He is all Fulness, and therefore it is not fit that we should carry any thing to him, as if he needed any thing from us: He is our Righteousness, and therefore if we have any, we must leave all behind us when we goe to him, &c. So that all we have to doe in this great work, is to goe to Christ weary, and sick, and filthy, and naked, stript of every thing but our sins and impurities, to receive Ease, and Health, and Fulness, and Beauty from him. Were we worthy to know how much of this our Author does deny, he should soon understand how much of it we own; but to serve us up a Medley, an Oleo of Truth and Errour, reproached Truth, and falsely imputed Errour, this I must needs say, (if he were the best Friend I have) is Intolerable; and yet in this Mist of Equivocations he hobbles on; Will he deny Christ to be a Physician, a Fountain, that he hath in him a Fulness, that he is Righteousness to*
Be-

Believers; that it is the Duty and Interest of the weary, heavy laden Sinner to make Addresse to him? Socinus, Volkelius, will allow it lawfull to pray to Christ, though they indeed deny it to be a Duty so to doe. If our Author can heal himself, and need not Christ to be his Physician; if he can cleanse himself, and need not that Fountain which God has set open for Sin and for Uncleanness; if he be full, and needs not be beholden to Christ for a supply; and has a righteousness of his own, which will cover his Nakedness, he has then a happy turn on't; onely let him not be angry with those poorer sort of Creatures that are willing to take Christs Counsell, Rev. 3. 18. *I counsel thee to buy of me Gold tryed in the fire, that thou mayst be rich, and white Rayment that thou mayst be clothed, and that the shame of thy Nakedness do not appear:* But I cannot sufficiently admire the Contradiction of his Conclusion: — And thus we must apply Christ to our Souls, and then what a blessed Change and Metamorphosis is there presently made in us; for though we continue as we were, we have all in Christ. A change made in us, and yet to continue as we were; A change and no change, to be as we were, and yet not what we were, is somewhat surprizing: They were just now charged that they went filthy to Christ, that they might be cleansed; naked to Christ, that they might be clothed; empty to Christ, that they might be filled; sick to Christ, that they might be healed; and yet after all, here's a Metamorphosis, a change made in them, and still they continue as they were; which has outdone, I dare say, all Ovid, who never durst, (and yet Poets and Painters dare doe almost any thing,) feign poor Daphne to be changed into a Laurel, and

yet

yet to continue fair Daphne still. As to my own thoughts, I have been taught from the Scriptures, to own Christ as my Physician, but I never had such a Crotchet in my head, That a blind man should have his Eyes open'd, and yet his Eyes continue as they were; that the dead should be raised, the Lepers cleansed, the deaf made to hear, and yet all be in statu quo; as they were. Nature is much delighted with Variety, and therefore that he may not alwayes scrape upon one string, our Author will find or take Occasion to fall upon one Mr. Watson; who it seems illustrating Christs entering into Covenant with a Soul, by the Manner of making a Marriage-Covenant amongst men, has introduced Christ and a Believer thus mutually engaging each to other: Christ saith to a Believer, *With my Body, yea with my Blood I endow thee; and a Believer saith to Christ, With my Soul I thee worship.* That Christ does really endow Believers with his Body and Blood, and all the Benefits procured by his Sacrifice, is out of doubt to all that are not Infidels. John 6. 51. *The Bread that I will give, is my flesh, that I will give for the life of the World.* V. 53. *Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his Blood, ye have no life in you.* V. 54. *Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my Blood, hath Eternal Life.* That Believers do enter into a mutual Covenant with Christ, to give up themselves in Spirits, Souls and Bodies, to love, serve, honour their Redeemer, is also evident, from Eph. 5. 24. *Christ is the head of the Church, and the Saviour of the Body, and therefore the Church is subject to Christ:* Now what a a pitifull sham does he return to this? As if (says he) Christ and a Believer were marryed by the Liturgy:

lurgy: The form of the Marriage Covenant in the *Liturgy* is not so absurd as he would render it, but that it may with decency express the Process of Christ and a Believers joyning in Covenant: But I fear, if we should sift the business a little more narrowly, we shall find our Author as far to seek in the *Liturgy*, as he is cross to the Articles of the Church of England; for Mr. Watson brings in the Spouse saying to Christ, *With my Soul I thee worship*; but the *Liturgy* teaches the Man to use those words to his Spouse, *With my Body I thee worship*: So that I see no great Danger that ever Christ and a Believer should be married by the *Liturgy*.

Again he cites Mr. Watson: *A Soul in Christ is actually united to him, and one with him, and being so, no sentence can fall on him, but the same must light upon Christ himself*: That true Believers are one with Christ, is very clear from the Gospel; and it would be much our Concern to clear up this one point, that we are true Believers; for the other is clear; 1 Cor. 12. 12. *As the Body is one, and hath many members, even so is Christ*; and therefore, there's no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the Flesh, but after the Spirit, Rom. 8. 1. A silly Jerk he has at this too. And who would desire to be more secure than Christ is? Why none that I know of. And so a short Horse is soon curried. What Mr. Watson had said before, in the Apostles words, that there is no condemnation to them that are in Christ; that he illustrates by this similitude: *As a Woman in Marriage, though she owe never so many Debts, yet the Arrest doth not light upon her, but upon her Husband*: And it has been owned as a Maxim in the Law, *Uxor lis non intenditur*.

intenditur: But let that be as it will; If the *Maid* Fors hold out, we can spare him *the Out-work*; let it be acknowledged a Truth, that *There is no C on-* demnation to them that are in *Christ*, and let the *Metaphor* scape as well as it can: O blessed *Priviledge*! (says he) who would be afraid of running in- to debt with God, when he hath such a kind Husband to discharge all? Any one surely that has an inge- nuous Spirit, as they all have who stand in that *Re-* lation to *Christ*: *Jesus Christ* does not onely take the Soul into a *Conjugal Relation*, but qualifies it that it may fill up the Dutyes of that Relation, with Love, desire to please, fear to offend, readiness to obey, with a spirit of thankfulness and fruitfulness, with a Heart studying, What shall I render to the Lord for all his Benefits? Who would be afraid? O vile, and abominable heart that could form such a *Conclusion of Sin*, out of the premises of abound- ing Grace; Who would be afraid? Nay, who would not tremble at the heart, to think least it should be drawn into sin, to the wounding of him afresh, that was wounded for me on the Cross: How shall I doe this wickedness, and sin against my Redeemer? Shall he be crucified by me, that was crucified for me? There's no such *Argument* in all the world a- gainst sin, as the Consideration of what I owe to him who loved me, and gave himself for me. I deny not but the *Dollrine of Grace* may be turned into lasciviousness, by them that never came under the Authority and soul-subduing Power of it; but when a self-condemned, self-aborred Sinner, comes to see what *Christ* has done and suffered for him, what he is to him, what he has wrought in him, the Re- sult whereof is: *Justification before a holy God*, and *Sanctification of Soul*, such a one will resort upon

R

the

the Tempter his own Temptation, with the greatest Abhorrency; Shall I continue in sin that Grace may abound? God forbid! Rom. 6. 15, 2.

Still Mr. Watson prosecutes the Priviledges of the Saints. — This is their glorious Priviledge, *Christs beauty and loveliness shall be put upon them.* Ay, (says our Author sneering,) *How vile and impure soever they are:* The old Crambe again: They shall have *Christs beauty* put upon them, and yet continue ugly still; they shall have *Christs whiteness* on them, and yet be as sooty and swarthy as before; but this is none of Mr. Watsons sence, but our Authors Non-sence, who durst tell the World as the Purport of these mens Expressions, That upon receiving Christ, there's a blessed Change made, and yet we continue as we were. But Mr. W. proceeds in the Priviledges of those that are engrafted into Christ, and made members of his Body. Nothing that ever was a member of Christ can be lost to Eternity. Can he lose a Member of his Body? then his Body is not perfect. No, fear not ye Saints, neither Sin nor Satan can dissolve your Union with Christ. Our Author is now turning Catechist, and asks this wise Question: But what if Sin should make them no Saints, would not that endanger the dissolving the Union? Yes indeed, it would endanger it, as much as a Man is in danger of dying, when his Head is chopt off; but I hope we may ask one Question for another: What if Christ will preserve them so effectually, that they shall not sin to that height, as to become no Saints? why then the Union is not dissolved; and so there's a Pot-lid for our Authors Pot. But Mr. Watson Reasons further, (our Author says sweetly, but I say it's no great matter for that, if he does it but strongly,)

If

*If any branch be pluckt away from Christ, it is either because Christ is not able to keep it, or because he is willing to lose it. And our Author Queries again, Why not because it will not stay? And I will tell him why, Because he has given it a will, and desire above all things in the world to stay with Christ. All Mr. Watsons unhappinefs is, that he had a good Cause; but not the Luck to hit upon our Authors convincing Argument; who p. 184. assures us, "That this New Life, wherein our Conformity to the Resurrection of Christ consists, is an immortal Principle of Life, which can no more die, then Christ can die again, now he is risen from the dead. And to shut up all, Mr. Shepheards Sincere Convert is brought upon the Stage, p. 77. though I could not meet with it till p. 113. "Weaknesses do not debarre us from God's Mercy: The Husband is bound to bear with the Wife as the weaker vessel, and can we think, that God will exempt himself from his own Rule, and not bear with his weak Spouse? It would have been something difficult to have made sport with such Innocent Expressions, but he had an *id est* left in his Budget, that never fails him: *Weakness* (says he) *that is, no strength, no grace, no nor so much as a sense of Poverty*: How false this is, Mr. Shephard will satisfy any one that will but consult the next Question, p. 116. Upon what Conditions may Christ be had? and he answers: "Give away thy self to him, give away thy Sins to him, give away thy Honour, Pleasure, Profit, Life to him, give away thy Rags, thy own Righteousness: You will say, you will have Christ with all your heart; but will you have him upon these Terms; upon these four Conditions? And*

now the total summe, the result of all that *these men* mean by *Accepting of Christ*, our Author gives us, with his wonted Caudour. "It is to be content to be saved by Christ, without being either humble, or holy, or fair, or beautifull, any otherwise than as he is pleased to make us so by his Satisfaction for our Sins, and the Imputation of his Righteousness to us. Nay, that's a Rapper; let him but look up to what he quoted from Mr. Shepheard: *Christ hath taken upon him to purge his Spouse, and make her fit for himself; and that she can never be, without being holy, humble, beautifull, by inherent Grace.* Shall I but entreat the Readers patience a very little, to lay his finger upon these words: *The result of all that they mean by coming to Christ, is to be content to be saved by him, without being holy, humble, or beautifull, &c.* and I will promise him, for his Patience and Pains, he shall within a Page or two, hear our Author most effectually confute his own Slander, and raise a Mighty Blister upon his own forgetfull Clapper.

And now our Author comes to consider what Duties are consequent upon such an Union and closure with Christ. As first, *A mighty love of the Soul, for her Saviour, Head and Husband; and Another is, Obedience to our spiritual Husband.* And now Reader, where didst thou lay thy finger? Are these the Men that are content to be saved by Christ, without being holy, humble, &c? Are these they that were charged, p. 56. with trusting to the Expiation of Christ for Salvation, without doing any thing themselves? Or are they the same men that were reproached, p. 62. as saying, *They had Nothing to doe, but to get an Interest in the Satisfaction and* Righte-

*Rigbrousness of Christ; and yet now are so hot for
 loving of Christ, that their great Crime is, that they
 over-love him, and are sick of love for him, and are
 all for Obedience to Christ too, resigning up them-
 selves to his Will, to be govern'd by his Laws, and
 in all things to glorifie him in New Obedience?
 Yes, but then it's very hard to find a proper place
 for Obedience in this New Religion: Well, but if
 we can find a proper place for it in the Old Religion,
 it's no great matter what place it has in the New:
 And indeed I would not have it Controverted, what
 place in Religion they will allow to Obedience, who
 are of no Religion, who are open Scoffers at Christ,
 the Holy Spirit, the Scriptures, and all Religion.
 Ay, but it's very hard to deduce it from an Acquain-
 tance with Christ's Person: Very Hard! what a
 word was that? why it's simply impossible to deduce
 any Religion at all from an Acquaintance with his
 Person; for all the acquaintance we have with him,
 is by an acquaintance with his Gospel, from whence
 we understand him to be God and Man; from thence
 we learn him to be King, Priest and Prophet;
 thence we learn what he has done and suffer'd for us;
 and what he is now doing for us at the Right hand
 of the Father. But why should it be so very hard
 to find a proper place for Obedience in these mens
 Religion? Why? Reason will tell you, that if there
 be any room at all for it, it must be either before
 our closing with Christ, or after it: Now indeed he
 argues close and home, and pursues his business as
 snug as you can desire. 1. Then this (Obedience)
 is not necessary at all to our coming to Christ, and
 closing with him: Not necessary? that's very strange!
 Coming to Christ, is with them a Main part of Obe-
 dience,*

dience; and to Obey without Obedience, is not so easie as he imagines. He that answers that Call of Christ [Come unto me] therein obeys him: and believing in Christ, has been reputed a considerable part of Gospel-Duty, 1 Joh. 3. 23. This is his Commandment, that we should believe on the Name of his Son Jesus Christ: That there are several Duties which flow from Faith, the Scripture, Church of England, and all men living doe acknowledge, but that this Believing is also a Duty, they must equally acknowledge. So that here's one proper place, or at least a Corner of a place, where he may wedge in Obedience, if he pleases. 2. (Says he) When the Marriage is consummated, there's less need of it than before: Nay, there his Non-fence is too open; He supposes them to own consequential Duties, such as follow the Marriage-covenant, and yet now he would perswade us, that there's less need of them, than before the Marriage-Covenant. If he can invent a way how consequential Duties should goe before the Marriage Covenant, by my consent he shall have the sole honour of the Discovery: In my poor Judgement, (and I am perswaded most men are of my Judgement) consequential Duties doe follow; or to humour him, following Duties ought to be consequential. There was once a Learned and Friendly Debate betwixt a Mayor and his Brethren, what the Question was, I am not very certain, but one wiser than the rest, had reduced the Matter to this Head: That if they could but make it out, that Edward the third reigned before Edward the first, they should carry the Cause: And if our Author can find any place, proper or improper, for consequential Duties, before that thing to which they are consequential,

rial, he shall be Registred amongst the great Benefactors to our understandings. - But yet in spight of Fate, he will not allow any place for Consequential Duties after Marriage, for then we have less need of them than before. A fine Argument if well Improved, to satisfie men in the Lawfulness of committing Adultery: But why not? 1. Then we are adorned with the Beauty of Christ: Ergo, we need no Inherent beauty. Then we are Justified: Ergo, we need not be Sanctified. 2. Then we are Holy with Christ's Holiness: Ergo, we need not be Holy. 3. Then we are delivered from the Guilt of sin by his Expiation: Ergo, we need not be delivered from the filth of sin. 4. Christ must look to see the Debt discharged [to God] which he hath taken upon him: Ergo, we owe no Debt of Gratitude to the Father for his Son, to the Son for his Love. 5. We are then righteous with his Righteousness, which gives us an actual right to Glory: Ergo, we need no Inherent righteousness to make us meet for Glory, and to partake of the Inheritance of the Saints in Light: All I shall say is this, If men may Argue at this Rate, they are the most formidable Disputants; we may cast our Caps at them; and it's as safe to handle the Torpedo, as to touch them with a long Pole. But such Merriment he is pleased to Divert his wearied Reader withal, and sometimes for Variety it may be Grateful, but really too much Nonsense in a Discourse is very odious.

For the Place (or rather no Place) of Obedience thusfar: An enquiry in the Reasons of it, seems also necessary. And for that, he says, *It's concluded on all hands, that this (Obedience) is but a Consequential Duty, that which ought to follow the*

Esponsals. But the Reason of it is not Evident: The Reason of the thing not Evident? Why, the thing is self is not evident: Would he have an evident Reason of Nothing? A Foundation for a Castle in the Air? Can he find no place for Obedience, and yet would he have a Reason for it? But for all this Raving, his Conscience tells him that they do allow a place for it, and can produce a Reason for it too, and perhaps a more proper place, and stronger Reason than our Author is able to show.

[1.] *Some tell us (says he) it is due upon the account of Gratitude, and thankfulness, to our Saviour. And methinks, a great deal of Obedience will rest upon that Basis: Has he come into this World (whither none that loved his ease would come?) Has he taken our Nature upon him, and (as if that were a light Matter) our sins? Has he endured the Displeasure of men, and (as if that were little) did it please God himself to put him to Grief? Did he Die for sinners? Does he Intercede for them? Has he revealed the whole Counsel of God to them concerning their Salvation? Has he given them the Holiest Laws, and the best Encouragement to Obey them? Did he Promise, and has he sent his Holy Spirit to dwell in their Hearts? Is it he through whom their Duties are accepted, and shall not these Obey? Here's enough, and yet there's much more to Engage all the Love, Service, Obedience, of Redeemed ones for ever: And so the thing is (at least) a hairs breadth longer than 'tis broad. But here our Author is at a Loss; he cannot so well understand this: But whose fault is that? Must the Truth suffer because he cannot see it? The truth is, he has Puzzled, and Perplexed himself*

self with an *Idea* scruple in his Head, and *Vulcan* must come with the great Hammer to deliver his Brain of a *Minerva*; though I know no Obligation lies upon me to *carry the Rope*, as often as he will *Snickle* his self: Yet hower, let's here the Difficulty: — Unless our Obedience be due to Christ, in thankfulness to him for saving us without Obedience. This is a Knot becoming the Sword of *Alexander*: Christ never engaged to save us without Obedience, and therefore he might have spared his pains to enquire how it should be due upon that Account: We therefore owe him all our Obedience, because 'tis through him that such Imperfect Obedience may find acceptance with God: Which is nothing more difficult than this, *We live to him, because he Died for us, and rose again*.

Yet there is a more formidable Objection in the rear, against the grounding Obedience upon the bottom of Gratitude. This is (says he) *Hardly reconcilable with that Essential Condition of accepting Christ, wherein those Spiritual espousals consists*. Well, though it be hardly, yet if it be reconcilable at all, we shall not create him the Trouble of being a Conciliator. There are rational Divines enough in the World, for whose Heads this Province may be reserved. Two things we must here find out if we can: 1. What is the Essential condition of our accepting Christ. 2. How Obedience due upon the account of Gratitude, comes to be so hardly reconcilable to that Essential condition. (1.) What is the Essential condition of our accepting Christ. For here lies the Intrigue, and he has so disguised Matters, and *Inck's* himself (like the *prophet*) in Confusion, that it will be hard to Catch him.

Now for that he quotes *plain J. O. Com. pag. 63. viz. That the Soul consents to take Christ on his own Terms: This is the Essential condition, that has Created all the Power: The Souls consenting to take Christ, is the Essential condition of taking. But now (2.) How is Obedience upon the account of Gratitude, irreconcilable to its consent to take Christ on his own Terms? Davin has made a difficulty, but where's an Oedipus to resolve it. Christ's Terms are, that the Soul shall give it self in Love and Obedience for ever: He requires that the Soul should be wholly and entirely his, and not for another; and this is so far from being Irreconcilable to (what he calls ridiculously) the Essential condition of accepting Christ, that it's directly Included in it. And this he might have been Taught from the Doctor, had he not been too Proud to Learn. *Ibid.* This accepting Christ by the will, as the Souls only Husband, Lord and Saviour, is called receiving Christ, John 1. 12. and is not intended for that Solemn Act only, whereby at first entrance we close with him, but also for that constant frame of abiding with him, and owning him as such. So that it would have been an Impossible task to part them, but very easie to reconcile them. Obedience is so far from being excluded by the Souls accepting Christ upon his Terms, that its simply impossible to accept him upon his own Terms; but we must Cordially, and with an Evangelical Universality obey him all our days. It's something late (I confess) yet let us hear what he further quotes from the Doctor: "The Soul consents to take Christ on his own Terms, to save save him in his own way, and faith, "Lord I would have had Thee, and Salvation, in
"my*

"my way, that it might have been partly of my
 "Endeavours, and as it were by the Works of the
 "Law; but I am now willing to receive Thee, and
 "to be saved in thy Way, merely by Grace. We
 have already seen that what he has *Quoted* and *Sum-*
mon'd in these words for, was marvellously *Im-*
pertinent to the *pretended purpose*; But that which
 will not make a *Shaft*, will make a *Bolt*. Never
 did our Author meet *that thing*, but he could make
some use on't: As they that study the *Philosophers*
Stone, though they miss of the *main Design*, yet
 stumble upon *some pretty Experiments* by the way,
 that makes them flatter themselves they have not
quite lost their *Oyl and Labour*. Thus, however
 our Author may be Frustrated in his *primary Project*,
 which was *Confuting the Truth*, yet probably he
 may find or make *some advantage* to *star the Do-*
ctor: You may see him here like the great *Hanibal*,
 making his way over the *Alps* with *Fire and Vine-*
gar. If there be *Matter* for a *Slander* above *Ground*
 he will have it, and if not, *Acheronta movebit*.
That is (says he) *without doing any thing*, with-
 out obeying thee: If to receive Christ upon his own
Terms, as a *King*, and abiding with him in that
relation, giving up it self to Christ as a *King* to
 obey him, be doing *nothing*, I cannot help it; but
 let our Author do but thus much, and he shall re-
 ceive a *Testimony* from God that he has *done all*.
 'Tis true, the Doctor excludes *all his own Obedi-*
ence for those ends, to which a proud Ignorant *Jew*
 might have *abused them*, viz. To exclude the *Free-*
Grace of God, and the *reconciliation* made by
 Christ: And this we ought to be *Jealous of*, lest we
 ascribe any more *Interest and concern* to our own
 Duties,

Duties, than the Gospel allows: The Question then shall never be stated by me thus: Whether we must Obey or no? Keep the Commandments of Christ or no? And that upon Peril of Eternal Damnation? But whether out of this Obedience of ours, may be gathered *that* righteousness in which we may safely venture to appear before the Judge of all the Earth in the great day; as that which we resolve to stand and abide by, venturing our all upon it? This is that the Doctor thinks the Apostle reprov'd; *Rom. 9. 31, 32. Israel which followed after the Law of righteousness, hath not attained to the Law of righteousness, because they sought it not by Faith, but as it were by the Works of the Law.* Where the Apostle intimates, that though we do not directly seek a righteousness by the Works of the Law, yet to do it Obliquely and Indirectly, is destructive; and that the Doctor intends no more, no other than this, is evident from the words our Author calls in; *And though I would have walkt according to my own mind, yet now I give up my self to be wholly guided by thy Spirit.* This Netled our Authors Conscience, and he takes Sanctuary in the most wretched Subterfuge that ever betrayed it's Consider; *What a pretty Complement does the Soul make to Christ?* We are now sheer gone from the Truth of the Principle, to the Truth of the Heart in receiving it. If it proves a Complement in the Mouth of an Hypocrite, yet in Thesis its a Truth; That whoever receives Christ upon his own Terms, does (renouncing his own will and way) give up himself wholly to be ruled by the Spirit, speaking in the Scriptures. At this w'd rate I have often heard a silly Quaker answer this Proposition: *Jesus Christ that Died*

Died at Jerusalem, is the Saviour of the World: Ay (says he) but dost thou witness that from the Light within?

[2.] Others make Obedience necessary upon the account of Christs Fulness: But this (he says) makes it no otherwise necessary, then as we are necessarily passive in it. However, if it be necessary upon any account; it's enough to make him blush that flatly Charges it upon them, to say it's not necessary: But to be passive in our Obedience, is all the Soul means, in giving up it self to be ruled by the Spirit of Christ. Then the Soul means Non-sense: For to give it self to be ruled by the Spirit, has something of Activity in it: Our help and assistance to give up our selves is from the Spirit, but the giving up is an act of the Souls. 'Tis the Believer that obeys, and yet the ability to obey is from the Holy Ghost: It's the Creature that works, and yet it's God that works in him, to will and to do of his own good Pleasure, Phil. 2. 13. It's the man that believes, and yet he believes according to the working of Gods mighty Power, Ephes. 1. 19, 20. What is it else that he prays to the Spirit for? O God the Holy Ghost, proceeding from the Father and the Son, have Mercy upon us miserable sinners? But all this might have been Superseded, had our Author duly Recollected what he has Subscribed, and openly given his Assent and Consent to, in the 10th. Art, of the Church of England. "We have no power to do Good works acceptable to God, without the Grace of God preventing us, that we may have a good Will and Working with us when we have that good Will. Allow but the Doctor the Benefits of the Clergie, and he will

will need no more to bring him off, though *that very Article* would prove our Authors *Neck-verse*. In the Work of Grace, the Spirit Acts according to the *Nature of the Subject*, which is here the *Rational Creature*; He gives not *new Natural Powers*, but a *new Moral ability* to Exercise them; he bestows not a *new Will Physically*, but enlarges *it from its Fetters*, discharges it *from its Slavery*, and powerfully (though Gently) *inclines* it to Gods Testimonies, not destroying *its radical self-determining Power*; and hence I conclude our Author is but *sorribly Skilled* in the *true meaning* of souls, when they Profess a *subjection to Christ*. The Soul meant *honestly*, she had no *Mental reservation*, none of these *Quirks and Tricks*, but plainly and sincerely *Designed to give up her self in all Obedience* to her Lord and *Saviour*; She in her *Text* intended *very singly*, but our Author has *Commented upon it Knavishly*: I said so indeed in haste, another would have said perhaps *Foolishly*; for what more Idle Chat could he have *Learnt* from the good Women his Neighbours at *Billings-gate*, than a *willingness to obey against ones Will*.

This is all our Author is willing to own of the Grounds of our Obedience, but I shall help his weak and frail Memory a little, though to his great Regret. "Doctor O. Com. pag. 212. Obedience "*(says the Doctor)* is necessary as a Means to the "*End. N. B.* God hath appointed that Holiness "*shall be the Means, the Way to that Eternal Life,* "*which as in it self, and Originally, is his Gift by* "*Jesus Christ, so with regard to his Constitution* "*of our Obedience, as the Means of attaining it,* "*is a Reward, and God in bestowing of it a Re-*
warder;

warder; though it be neither the Cause, Matter,
 nor Condition of our Justification, yet it is the
 Way appointed of God for us to walk in for the
 obtaining of Salvation. And therefore he that
 hath hope of Eternal Life, Purifies himself as he is
 Pure, and none shall ever come to that End, who
 walketh not in that Way; for without Holiness
 it is impossible to see God. The *bare Repetition*
 of which words are as plain, and full a Rebuke
 to all our Authors Dirty, Nasty Reflections, as a
reasonable Creature can desire. But these things we
 shall meet withall anon, and therefore here they shall
 lie ready in Banco, till our Authors Leisure shall call
 for them.

I had now eased my self and my Reader, of any
 further Vexation in this Section, had I not unhap-
 pily overseen *one Passage* in Mr. Watson, from which
 our Author thinks he has *some Advantage*. The
 words are these: "Evangelical Truths, will not
 down with a Natural Heart, such a one had ra-
 ther hear some quaint Point, of some Vertue or
 Vice stood upon, than any thing in Christ, &c.
 Which he thus Canvasses: "Such sanctified Souls,
 and Ears, loath all Doll, Insipid, Moral Discourses,
 which are perpetually Inculcating their Duty on
 them, and Troubling them with a great many
 Rules and Directions for a good Life, which he is
 pleased to call the Quaint Points of Vertue and Vice.
 Good Sir, be not angry, have but a little Patience
 and all will be well to your Hearts Content. Mr.
 Watson does not Inveigh against your *Poynt In-*
villives against the one, or your most *Elaborate*
Encomiums of the other. Run down sin at the high-
 est rate of Zeal and Fervency you can; render Pro-
 phane-

phanefs as *Odious*, and expose her for a *Falsom*
Jourvy Baggage; if you please, Invent new Names
 for her, with that *Reverend Divine*, and tell her
 to her Teeth she is a *Tatter-de-mallion*, and a *Rap-*
scallion; And let *Vertue*, *Duty*, and a good *Life*,
 be Urged and Pressed upon the Conscience with
 the most *Cogent Arguments*, that Reason and Scrip-
 ture will afford you. Mr. *Watson* will Live, and
 Sleep, and Love you: They are only these *Quaint*,
Nice, *Finical points of Vice and Vertue*, which he
 and all *Judicious Christians* (who had rather have
 their *Hearts and Lives bett'rd*, than their *Ears*
rickled) do Disgust. A *Quaint point of Vice*, at
 which your *Jesuites* are so Excellent, that they have
 acquainted the World with more *Sublimated and*
Speculatives Rogueries, than perhaps else the *Devil*
himself had ever thought of: Such we meet with
 in their Books of *Casuistical Divinity*; where men
 are Taught an *Art of sinning*, to be *Killanous in*
Mood and Figure; and as some have reacht the
 perfection of *Poysoning* by Smells at a distance, so
 have these *Infected the World* with their *Theories*
of Monstrous Debaucheries: They have starved
Game for *unclean hearts* to Hunt down, and set
 unsanctified *Nature* agog, for those *Pollutions* of
 which it had else lived in a *blessed Ignorance*. There
 are *Quaint points of Vertue* too, which will not
 down with any *sanctified Souls and Ears*, who de-
 fire to hear of their Redeemer, and their Obligati-
 ons to him, upon the Account of what he has Pur-
 chased and Procured for them: When one that *sup-*
pies the p'ace of the Minister, but more fit to fill
 up the room of the *Idiot*, shall with a *starched Gra-*
vity, Dress you up a *Vertue Ala-mode*, like a
Merice-

*Morice-dancer with a comely Feather in her Cap, Ribbands at her Ears, and Tuneable Bells at her Heels; and then come off with a Flourish; Oh what a goodly thing is this Madam Vertue! Let him that speaks, speak as becomes the Oracles of God; let him without affected Quaintness, with a serious Spirit, in the Words which the Holy Ghost teacheth, open the Excellency, demonstrate the Necessity of any Vertue, and Mr. Watson is very well contented: Having now made an Essay towards the Reconciling Mr. W. and our Author, I hope I may without Offence proceed. Before our Author takes his leave of his Reader, (which he does with much Civility) he lets him know what he has had for his Money. First, (he tells him) *He has given him an entire Scheme of a New Religion, resulting from an acquaintance with Christs Person.* But we crave leave to Demur to that. It's neither a Scheme, much less an entire Scheme of any Religion New or Old, only a *Wisp*, that he set up to himself to Scold at: Next he lifts up his *Masque*, that we may see the full Face of his Design, for hitherto he has been in *Masquerade*, and that he tells us was to *Expose these Mens Principles to Scorn: But that we saw through his Vizor, and needed not his Gazette to give us an Advertisment, that his chiefest Talent lies in Misrepresenting mens Persons, their Expressions and Intentions, in casting Dirt upon the the sincerest Actions, and Invidiously traducing the greatest Truth of the Gospel.* Thirdly, He tells us: *That every considering Person cannot but discover how Inconsistent the Religion of Christs Person and of his Gospel are.* But this Distinction was but the Superfétation of his own Parturient Brain; we*

S

own

own one God, and one Mediator between God and man, one holy Spirit, one Faith, one Baptism, delivered to us in the Scriptures of Truth: And further than the Scriptures have a Tongue to Speak, we have no Ear to Hear. Whereas therefore a certain Vagrant Principle [concerning the difference betwixt the Religion of the Person, and Gospel of Christ] has been taken Begging at our Doors, and would have Farther'd it self upon us: Now know all men whom it may Concern, that we have Executed the Law upon it, have Stript and Whipt it, and do hereby send it from Constable to Constable, till it shall come at the Parish of St. George Buttolphs Lane, and the Rectory there, where the Brat was Born and Bred, and there 'tis most fitting it should be Maintained.

The Reader cannot but Observe, that (how Hotly soever our Author is Engaged in the Pursuit of his Design, yet) he can always find leisure to have a Fling at the Acquaintance of Christs Person. If there were but two things in all the World to Rail at, one of them should be Acquaintance of Christs Person. Hence it is that he has not got a finer Nick-name, for those he would Vilifie than, the Acquaintances of Christ. Thus, pag. 55. *As these bold acquaintance and familiars of Christ use to speak, p. 68. As another great acquaintance of Christ speaks,* which though it be perfect Nonsense, yet serves to express his Scolding Humour well enough: Now I confess I cannot Divine what should thus give Fire to his Choler, and enflame his Passion against acquaintance with Christ. It must be either the Name, or the thing it self, that I am satisfied in. (1.) Then, Is it that Term that dislikes him? Alas poor Word! What harm had it ever done him? I could wish that

that to prevent Quarrels, and keep the Peace, he may have liberty to make some other word its Substitute and Surrogate. Let it be the Knowledge of Christ, the Understanding of Christ, or what ever other Synonima his Sylva will furnish him with; rather than to have such a continual Peal rung in our Ears with this Acquaintance. And yet he might have known, that the Word is no worse than what the Learned Translators of our English Bible saw, (or thought they saw) Reason to employ: It has now lain so long Mellowing in that Version, that it might be presumed to have lost the Austerity of its Nature, and to have been Sweetned to his Curious and Judicious Palate. In Job 22. 21. Acquaint now thy self with him, and be at peace. *הַסְכֵּן נָא עִמּוֹ*. And the word signifies to Familiarize our selves to a Thing, or Person. And the same word is used to express Gods own Knowledge of, and Acquaintance with his Creatures, and all their ways, Psal. 139. 3. Thou art acquainted with all my ways, *דַּסְכֵּנִיָּהוּ וְכָל דְּרָכַי*. And its opposed to a strange, overy Carriage; when we live at a distance from another, as if there was no good and clear Correspondence between us; and the truth is, it implies a thing called Communion, and therein lies its Guilt. But, 2. I suspect that it is acquaintance with Christs Person; that has provoked all this Rage: Acquaintance with any Thing, or Person, else might have scaped a Scouring; and yet under Correction. 1. The Scripture presses it as our Duty to Study, Understand, and get a through Knowledge of the Person of Christ, 2 Pet. 3. 18. But grow in Grace, and in the Knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, to him be Glory, both now and for ever, Amen. And, 2. We

find holy Men to have made it their business to get an acquaintance with Christs Person, which this Gentleman makes it his business to Reproach, 1 Cor. 2. 2. *I determined not to know any thing amongst you, save Jesus Christ, & τὸν ἰσχυρόν, even him Crucified.* The Person of Christ under that consideration, as Crucified; and the Reasons are as Cogent, as the thing is clear. For, 1. In the Knowledge of Christ (that very Christ whom the Father sent into the World) consists Eternal Life: This is Life Eternal to know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent. 2. VVe are Commanded to love this Jesus, (another great fault our Author finds with these Men) but how to love him and not to be acquainted with him, may be reckoned amongst the Impossibilities, 1 Pet. 1. 7. *At the appearing of Jesus Christ, whom having not seen ye love; in whom (though now ye see him not) yet believing ye rejoyce with Joy unspeakable, and full of Glory.* The Apostle commends their love to, and faith in an unseen Saviour; whence it's easie to conclude, that it was the Person of Christ they loved; for the Scriptures they had seen, the Gospel, the Church they had seen, (an Office I confess they could not very well see) and yet they are praised for loving him that was not seen. 3. VVe are commanded to Worship this Jesus, to give Divine Honour to Him, John 5. 23. *That all should Honour the Son, even as they Honour the Father:* And accordingly we read that the Disciples did Worship Him, Luke 24. 52. Nay, the Command is given to the Angelical Nature, Heb. 1. 6. *Let all the Angels of God Worship Him:* But it's a strange kind of Worship that we give Darklings. One of the

the smartest Rebukes Christ gave the *Samaritans*, was, that they *Worshipped they knew not what*, but *We* (says Christ) *know what we Worship*, *αὐτὸς προσκυνῶμεν τὸ ὁιδόμενον*. VVe must not only know *who He is*, but *what He is* whom we worship.

4. It's our plain duty to acquaint our selves with God, that we may be at peace, *Job 22. 21*. But Christ is true God, very God; witness the *Athanasian*, and *Nicene Symbols*. 5. VVe are in particular commanded to believe in Him, *John 14. 1*. *Ye believe in God, believe also in me*. And it concerns us to know, by what authority he Imposes his Commands upon us, what is his *Veracity* that we may depend upon his Promises, and what is his Power to carry us through the difficulties that ever attend conscientious Duties, to *Eternal Life*: I am the more for acquaintance with Christ's Person, because it's so great a Venture to trust the unknown. This Prudence all men will be sure to exercise in Common affairs, much more where Souls and *Eternal Life* lie at stake; and such did the Apostle Practise, *2 Tim. 1. 12*. *I know whom I have believed*. 6. The whole Design of the Scripture leads us to an acquaintance with the Father, Son, and blessed Spirit. Hence was the Apostle so Zealous, that the *Colossians* might come unto all Riches of the full assurance of Understanding, to the acknowledgment of the *Mysterie of God*, *καὶ τὸ πρὸς τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὸν υἱόν* Even of the Father, and of Christ, in whom are hid all the Treasures of Wisdom and Knowledge: VVhich are those Provoking words that have so often Ruffled our Author's thoughts into Disorder.

7. The whole of the Scripture is an unaccountable Riddle, without the Knowledge of Jesus Christ: VVe are told there,

there, how God has been atoned by the Sacrifice of Oxen, Sheep; what a sweet smelling savour he has sent in the burned Flesh of the Holocaust; which without Consideration of the Person of Christ, and Reference to Him, is Irrational. To speak of the Death of Christ himself, as reconciling God and man, is also wholly Unintelligible, without due regard to Him as Mediator, what Office he bore, what Place he filled, in whose Stead he stood, what that Covenant was, that between the Father and his Son was agreed upon: For according to our common apprehension of Things, God should rather have Destroyed the World for Crucifying his Son, than have been Reconciled and Propitiated by his Death.

Now I know well our Author will Reply, that he (good Man) is no Enemy to acquaintance with Christs Person, provided always we do not Vire-draw New Doctrines from it, and Extract greater and deeper Mysteries thence, than are to be found out in the Gospel. To which we Rejoyn: That it's not Christs Person that teaches us the Doctrine; but the Doctrine that Acquaints us with his Person. We study not the Person of Christ, to find out Gospel Mysteries, but to resolve them: Not to Discover the *in* of New Truths, but to Demonstrate to us the *in* of the Old. But if, after all that can be said, our Author will be Clamorous, we must be Content, and Satisfie our selves with this, that it's the Nature of the Creature; and some things we know are so untractable by their Constitution, that though 'yon Bray them in a Mortar amongst Wheat with a Pestle, yet their Crabbed, Froward, Awkward Tempers will not depart from them.

CHAP.

CHAP. III. Sect. 3.

How unsafe it is to found Religion upon a Pretended Acquaintance with Christs Person.

I Foresee *this Section* will certainly prove *Unanswerable*; the Comfort is, it's the *onely one* that appears to be *such* in the whole Book. The Reader will judge with me, that he must needs have a *hard Task* on't, (and perhaps equal to any of *Hercules* his Labours,) that shall maintain it safe, *To found Religion upon Hypocrisie*; and yet this must be his lot, who will defend, *That it's safe to build Religion upon a pretended Acquaintance with Christs Person*. Some report, that that Goodly Beast, which for *Honours sake* we will call a *Porcupine*, keeps alwayes *Two Avenues* to her Cell, that let the Wind sit where it will, it shall never blow *full in the Dore*; and let her Enemies besiege her how they can, she has a *secret Sally-port*, to creep out at. With the *same wisdom* has our Author provided for his own *Retreat* in this Section: For if any shall be so fool-hardy as to assault him with an Argument, *That it's our Duty to be acquainted with Christs Person*, and for that end to *search the Scriptures, which testifie of him*, direct, and lead us to him; that so upon the *Person of our Redeemer* we may build our Faith, as upon that *Rock* against which the *Gates of Hell*

shall not prevail; he can readily reply upon you, True; but it's onely a *Pretended* Acquaintance with Christs Person, that I so zealously declaim against. I perceive, it's no small advantage in all Disputes, to have the Priviledge to *stare the Question* to our own good liking; and he that has once got a *Faculty* for it, is out of Gun-shot; unless he be so incorrigible a Coxcomb as not to be aware of his own Interest. That the Religion of Sinners is built upon a Mediator, (as the Religion of the Innocent was upon the Being of a God;) That this Mediator is the Lord Jesus Christ, who has by the Sacrifice of Himself reconciled God to Man, and Man to God; has received some Light and Confirmation from these Papers. That our Author has opposed any thing that may stagger the Faith of Christians; tolerably exercised in the Word of Righteousness, I do not see: but that it's easie to erect a Castle in the Aire, and when we have so done, to draw a formal siege about it, to batter, storm, rase, and utterly demolish it, not to leave one stone upon another; this I grant he has satisfied me in to satiety. For, having all along laid it for the ground-work of his most accomplisht Raillery, That some men found all their Religion upon the Person of Christ, exclusive of the Scriptures, he is now resolved to destroy that Hypothesis, to give it no Quarter, but even to Internecion plow up the Foundation, and sow it with Salt, that After-ages may sing goodly Ballads of his Atchievement, *Eam seges est ubi Troja fuit*. Thus when the Creative Power of the Imagination has given Life to a Chimera, the same Power, with the same ease can stop it's breath, annihilate it, and calcine it to it's primitive Nothing. There are Two

part 1

parts of his present Discourse; First, a *false Supposition*; Secondly, a most *unmercifull Confutation* of that Supposition.

(1.) That which he supposes, (and is resolved to suppose in spite of Fate,) is, that *These men* you wot of, *Pretend to learn their Religion from an Acquaintance with Christs Person*, (to which he often addes, and alwayes understands) *without Gospel Revelation*. A Supposition so idle, absurd, and palpably false, that none can possibly believe it of *those* Persons upon *whom* 'tis fixt; but those (and some such there are) that have *accustomed* themselves to tell a *Lye* so often, till at length they begin to be pretty well perfwaded that they speak Truth: Happy men, that have found an Expedient, so far to mitigate their Guilt, that what was before a *formal Lye*, becomes now onely a *material Untruth*! That *Jesus Christ is God and Man*, that he dyed for our Sins, and rose again for our Justification, that he was set forth by God to be a *Propitiation* for sin, to declare Gods Righteousness for the Pardon of it; that he is our *High-Priest*, our *Advocate* with the Father, with whatever else comes within the compass of *their Creed*, they do solemnly profess to have learnt from the Gospel onely; and further than as Scripture has been Liberal herein, they protest in so many Letters and Syllables, they know nothing less or more; these things are owing purely to *Revelation*; and they are ready, when or wheresoever cited before their competent Judges, to give it under their Hands and Seals, attested with all the Good men and True, of the *Vicinage*. The plain Truth is, Their Principles lie in it, their Writings witness to it, and at other times they are reproach'd by these
very

very same unreasonable men, that they so tenaciously, and pertinaciously adhere to the written Word, that they make it the Rule of their Faith, the Rubrick of their Worship, the Directory of their Prayers, the Square of their Obedience, the Treasury of their Hopes, and the grand Cynosure whereby they steer, or desire to steer the whole Course of their Conversation to Eternal Life.

(2.) The Confutation of this Hypothesis (which is his second Travel) must therefore needs be very easie. And to this purpose, he brings us in two pompous Reasons mounted like St. George himself on horse-back, armed Cap-a-pe, with his Trusty Morglay by his side, his Launce ready couch'd; but all this while, where's the Dragon? Or like a Champion of State, who upon the Coronation of some Great Prince, presents himself in rigid Steel, throws down his Gantlet, defies all Men, Women and Children, in defence of the Princes Title, when he knows well enough before-hand, that none will Take it up. Now his Reasons are drawn, the former from the uncertainty of such a Way, and the Second (which is as strong as the other) from the uncertainty of such a Way. Reader do not smile; It was no less a Piece than the Great Demosthenes, who being ask'd, What were the Main Qualifications of a Good Oratour, answer'd, The first is Pronunciation, the second Pronunciation, and the third (forsooth) was Pronunciation: But stay awhile, and you will see our Author come off well enough.

[1] His first Argument is taken from the uncertainty of such a procedure; This is at best to build Religion upon uncertain Conjectures; we agree to it; and whatever I could be content to be

at

at a loose end in, it should not be my Religion: but yet for more sureness he lines his Argument with an under-reason, (and had he faced it with Bayes, it would have worn like Steel;) *Had we seen Christ in the flesh, and been witnesses of the many Miracles he wrought, of his Death upon the Cross, and his Resurrection from the Dead, had he not acquainted us with the End and Design of all this, we might have ghes'd, and ghes'd till we had been weary, but it's odds we had never ghes'd right.* Nay, yet further to overwhelm all Opponents with Reason upon Reason, he addes; *Because there's no natural and necessary connexion between the Person of Christ, and what he did and suffer'd, and the Salvation of Mankind; for these things are available for those Ends to which God design'd them, the virtue and efficacy of them, depends upon God's Institution and Appointment, and therefore can be known onely by Revelation.* So that his Conclusion is this: *Whoever would learn the Religion of our Saviour, must learn it from his Doctrine, and not from his Person.* To say the Truth, the greatest fault I find with all this is, that he *betrays the Truth* he contends for; and does not understand, that his Clyent had better have given him a *Double Fee* to say Nothing, than a *single one* to Destroy the Cause he pretends to plead. I shall therefore only burden his Margin with a few asterisks, and fairly dismiss him.

1. Let the Reader carefully enquire who those *We* are, that if they had *seen Christ in the flesh*, his *Miracles, Death and Resurrection*, yet without *He* had acquainted them with the *End and Design of all this*, might have *ghes'd themselves weary, ere they had ghes'd aright?* And for the clearing of that,

that, let him know, that he speaks not here in his own Person, but in the Person of others, who have not the *knack*, or if they had, are not fortified with a *Priviledge* to conclude *Quidlibet ex Quolibet*, or to demonstrate *Godwin-Sands* from *Tenterdon-Steeple*; for as to *Himself*, you may be pleased to understand, that he can infallibly prove all this and more, from as little as that comes to, and less. Admire his Abilities, pag. 84. When We remember that *Christ* died as a *Sacrifice* and *Propitiation* for *Sin*, this gives Us a great *Demonstration* of *Gods* good will to us, how ready he is to pass by all our former sins, in that he hath appointed an *Atonement* for us, and given no less Person than his own Son for our *Ransome*. The Reader cannot but observe, that he is there giving us *Another Scheme* of Religion from an *Acquaintance* with *Christs* Person, without *Scripture*; and then when he comes to take the Matter in hand, he can from the Person of *Christ*, demonstrate *Gods* good Will, his pardoning *Mercy*, and what not? when others indeed venture upon *Conclusions* without *Scripture*, they give some uncertain conjectures, get some feeble hints, some dim appearances and smattering *lucklings* of the Matter; but to Us it speaks nothing less than *Apodictical*, and great *Demonstration*.

2. The Reader will observe, how perfectly he Overthrows the very design he would exalt; for undertaking to prove, *How unsafe it is, to found Religion upon a Pretended acquaintance with Christs Person*; and assigning this for a Reason, that this is to build Religion upon uncertain Conjectures, which we acknowledge to be Cogent; When he comes to wind up his bottomes, he tells us, *Though*
we

we had seen Christ in the flesh, we cou'd never have guess'd at the End and Design of it, had not be [Christ] Acquainted us with it. So that the short and long of this great Demonstration, is this; That it's uncertain to found our Religion upon Christ's Person, because we could have known nothing of Religion, unless we had been Acquainted with him: He will lift himself off this flatt, by replying, that he means nothing but Christ's acquainting us in and from his Gospel; and we rejoyn, that that which will bring him off, will bring off his Neighbours; for who ever affirm'd any more?

3. He has herein at unawares stabb'd his main Cause to the heart; For if there be no necessary connexion between the Person of Christ, his Death and Suffering, and the Salvation of Mankind, but that (as he assures us) the End and Design of Christ in dying, must be known onely by Revelation; then it will unavoidably follow, that Christ dyed for some greater Ends than to give us an Example of Patience, and Submission to the Will of God, to Confirm what he Preach'd; seeing we needed no Revelation to acquaint us, that a holy man is to be imitated in all holy things, living or dying; and that he thought (at least) his Doctrine was true, or else he would never have expos'd, and layd down his Life to justify it. Now it's plain, however our Author does now and then humour us with Propitiation, Ransom, Atonement, Expiation, these are all reducible by his Engine, to Christ's confirming what he preach'd; Pag. 320. All that I can find in Scripture, concerning the Influence that the Sacrifice of Christ's Death hath upon our Acceptation with God, is, that to this we owe the Covenant of Grace; which is Nothing else
in

in his sence, but *God's Promise of saving us, if we obey his Laws.*

4. He is slipt into the *very same guilt* with which he loads (though unjustly) his Adversaries, viz. *The Dividing the Person and Gospel of Christ.* He was of a good Mind once, p. 3. if he could have kept him in't: That *the Person of Christ is not at oddes with his Gospel*, and that *Christ and his Religion were well agreed*; but he has quitted his Post, and dogmatically asserts: That *whosoever would understand the Religion of our Saviour, must learn it from his Doctrine, and not from his Person.* And why not from his Person, in or by his Doctrine? It's a harder matter than our Author is aware, to hear a *Sermon preach'd without a Preacher*; and almost as difficult to believe it, without good warranty, that the *Preacher has good Authority* for what he delivers: All the *Authority of the Scripture*, is resolved into the *Authority of Christ*, and therefore it concerns us to fetch our Religion from Christ, by his Word.

5. I must needs observe to the Reader one piece of *cleanly conveyance and Legerdemain*, which our Author is forced frequently at a standing-pull to serve himself of, to draw Dun out o'th' Mire; and that is, to shew you a *fair round Tester*, and then sob you off with a Counter; to shew you a *Horse* in the Premises, and pass to an *Ass* in the Conclusion. He has *posted*, and *posted* it up in the Title of this Section; How unsafe it is, to found Religion upon a *Pretended acquaintance with Christs Person*; but when he addresses himself to prove his Thesis, he falls a persecuting the old thing of *Learning Religion from an Acquaintance with Christs Person*. He who has the famous Art of *Arguing*
from

from the essential Differences of things, can he find no accidental difference at least betwixt *Principium essendi* and *Cognoscendi*? Betwixt the Foundation of our Religion, and the Means of conveying the Knowledge thereof unto us? A thing may be first in Knowledge, which is last in Being; there has been some such Distinction in former Ages. There was a time when the old World learnt it's Religion from Angels, (as our Author thinks) from Prophets, from the Government of the World; will he say that the Religion of those dayes was founded upon any thing short of God, upon Angels, Men, Sun, Moon, Stars? Say the same in our Case; Jesus Christ has revealed what we are to know and believe of the Father, Son, and Spirit, (in his Word he has reveal'd it) yet our Faith, Hope, Love, Obedience is founded on, and ultimately terminated in God alone by Christ: He that believes a Promise, obeyes a Precept, does believe the veracity of Christ in that Promise, and obey the Authority of Christ in that Precept: That *Credit* we give to Letters Patents præmunit with the Royal Seal, is resolved ultimately into the Kings authority; That Obedience we give to a Law, is founded upon the Authority of the Legislator: We learn our Duty from a printed Act of Parliament, from a Proclamation, but that which is the formal Reason of our Duty, is the Relation wherein we stand to our Prince: So childish is our Author in his Reasonings, he begins to make a Cauldron, and tinkers up a sordid kettle; *Amphora cæpit institui, currente rotâ cur urceus exit?* He undertook to prove the unsafeness of the Foundation of our Religion, but he's glad to come down a button-hole lower, and prove onely the danger of learning of our Religion from

from a pretended acquaintance with *Christs Person*; without Scripture-Revelation.

6. He tells us, *there is not a Natural and Necessary connexion between the Person of Christ, his Death, &c. and the Salvation of Mankind.* Very discreetly worded: *Not a natural, and necessary connexion!* What's matter if it be not *Natural*, if it be *Necessary*? Let it be owned *Necessary* any way that's fair and honest, and let him choose whether it shall be *necessary by Nature*, or no. If our Author understands himself here, it's very well; I am sure some others do not: Does he mean therefore of all *Mankind*? that there's no natural connexion betwixt *Christs Person, his Death, &c. and the Salvation of all Mankind*? I presume, the man's either unborn, or long agoe dead, that ever asserted that there was any *Connexion* either *Natural* or *Necessary*, between *Christs Death* and the *Salvation* of every individual Person that should be upon the Earth: Does he mean *anyone of all Mankind*? I then do affirm, and will abide by it, that upon supposition the Son of God was incarnate, took our *Nature* upon him, and in that *Nature* dyed a *curst Death*, there is a *Necessary connexion* betwixt the *Death of the Son of God*, and the *Salvation of some, at least, of Mankind*: It's very unconceivable, that *Christ* should submit to such a *Dispensation*, and have no fruit of his Labour. But to put him out of fear, that he may sleep at hearts ease, we do not fancy any *natural connexion* of these things; that Bond that tyes them together, is the compact betwixt the Father and the Son, that upon his *Souls being made an Offering for Sin*, he should see his seed, and the pleasure of the Lord should prosper in his hand, Isa.

§3. 10. The Total is this, The Concurrence of the Sons Will, with the Fathers good Pleasure, gave the Death of Christ a necessary Connexion with the Salvation of some, at least, of Mankind. But to talk at this loose Rambling rate is tedious.

All this while, you see but very little into our Authors Design: For as your great Politicians have their *Causa justifica*, which they Hang out to view, but the *Causa suavioria* lie deep, and are not to be Expofed to, and Prophan'd by common Eyes. Thus however our Author makes a Flourish, and Vapour, about the Connexion of Necessary causes and Necessary effects, as if we see Fire, we know it burns something; and if we see Smoke, we may safely conclude there is some Fire: Which poor Reynolds Experiment would have Confuted. Notwithstanding I say all this Ostentation of Mysterious Philosophy, there was something lay nearer his heart, than this Bombaste; and how to bring it upon the Stage handsomely, required good Deliberation. In plain Terms, it was nothing but to state a Parallel betwixt the Rational, and your Systematical Divine, and to Demonstrate the excellency of himself and those of his exalted Intellectuals, above those low Spirited, Phlegmatick, Tigurine Doctors, who Trade all in gross Bodies, and unweildy Systems of Divinity: For these latter, they (Dull-men) shape all Religion, according to their Phancies and Humours, and stuff it with an infinite Number of Orthodox Propositions; (such as the 39 Articles.) But now for your Rational Men: "They Argue the Nature of God, his Works and Providences, from the Nature of Mankind. and those eternal Notions of Good and Evil, from the Es-

T

"fential

" Essential differences of Things, from plain Principles, which have an Immutable and unchangeable Nature, and so can bear the weight and stress, of a just Consequence: Which singular Happiness may sooner be Envyed than Mistared. Indeed it would do any man good at Heart, to hear with what Nerves and Sinews of Brawny Reason, they will Argue; how they Drive all before them; how they will Trowne a poor amazed Auditor into Aff. and Con. and force the most Obstinate herds of Contumacious Animals, into good Behaviour by Duress. In a word, all their Discourses are Muscle, and Cartilage: And in one of these you shall have the Marrow and Pith, the Quintessence and Elixir of your Profound, Irrefragable, Subtile, Angelical, Seraphical Doctors: But I Chide my self for comparing them to the School-men, who are Systematical Theologues. Let the Reader content himself with a short Specimen of their Abilities. And, 1. They argue from the Nature of God: How Facile is he to Pardon sin, all sin without any Compensation, or Satisfaction made to his Justice: For seeing Justice is but a secondary Attribute, a mere Instrument or Tool of Government; He may spare or punish as he sees Reason for it without being unjust in either: For though the Scripture has told us, *Psalm 24. 19. That God is a jealous God, who will not forgive Transgression, nor sin; and that He is of purer Eyes than to behold Evil, and cannot look upon Iniquity, Hab. 1. 13.* And also that the wages of sin is Death, which is the Religion of the Scripture, yet now one of these familiar acquaintance of Gods Nature, can inform you better; that there was there was no necessity of Christs Death

to declare the Righteousness of God, that he might be Just, but that as he Pardoned the Old World for Four Thousand Years together, who knew nothing of Christ; so he might have done for one poor Sixteen Hundred Years more, and as much longer as it shall continue. That Caution which he Hints to others, pag. 76. he has as much need of himself; That we be wary in drawing conclusions from Gods Nature, since 'tis so seldom we have any good Assurance, those Inferences are Genuine. Thus when he argues, pag. 43, from Gods Long-suffering and Patience towards the World, and the various Methods God uses to reclaim them, that therefore he is as ready to Pardon sinners, as a kind Father is to receive a penitent Prodigal. I would have him Cautious lest he should over-run the Constable, for God stands not related to sinners, in the state of lapsed Nature, as a Father, but as an Enemy; and our Son-ship and Adoption, comes in by Jesus Christ, and this may perhaps a little disturb the Connexion of his Antecedents and Consequents: And this for distinction-sake, may be called his New Religion of Gods Nature, from whence we learn those greater and deeper Mysteries whereof the Scripture is so silent. And then, 2. They argue with marvellous Success from the Works and Providence of God. As how? pag. 44. " Those Natural Notions the
 " Heathens had of God, and the Discoveries God
 " made of Himself in the Works of Creation and
 " Providence, did assure them that God is very
 " Good, and that 'tis not possible to understand
 " what Goodness is without Pardoning-Grace. For
 you may be sure they could not see the Sun shine, but presently they must conclude that the Light of Gods

Countenance would shine upon them also; nor have a *showre of Rain*, but it did Demonstrate that God would wash away their sins; nor forbear them a day, but He would acquit them forever. But then, 3. *From the Nature of Mankind*, they Reason with incomparable Judgment: As for Instance, That because Man was Created upright, therefore he is so still; how *Vegete*, *Sprightly*, and *active mans Nature* is, that without the Subsidiary assistance of *effectual Grace*, working both to will and to do, it can fulfil all Gods Commandments; and that to talk of our own Impotency to Spiritual performances, is to suppose us to be *alked like Machines* by an *External force*, and the irresistible *Grace and Spirit of God*. And further, 4. They make admirable work from the eternal Notions of Good and Evil: That God may punish sin if he pleases, and if he sees good he may let it alone; sin it seems, is one of those *Adiaphorous Trifles*, that it needs not the Blood of Christ to satisfy for it; for our own repentance, without any respect to the Death of Christ, will stop that Gap: Wherein, I confess, I as little admire his Divinity, as he does other mens Philosophy. But, 5. They argue from the *Essential differences of Things*, and what rare Feats they can do from hence is Incredible: For whereas other poor Sneaks only deal with the Rinde and Back of Beings, as they are cloathed with Circumstances, and trusted over with Accidents; these Gyants of Reason will strip your Nature stark naked, and show her for a Sight at *Bartholomew-Fair*, in her first callous Principles. Thus our Author tells us, pag. 94. That Christ came not to distract us with the Inexorableness of Gods Justice; and yet p. 95.

He

He assures us that God is an Irreconcilable Enemy to all sin: For he could pry out an Essential difference between the Inexorableness of his Justice, and his Irreconcilableness to sin. And pag. 82. He can shew us the difference between being astonished, and surprised with wonder; which though any other might have stumbled on: Yet to shew you just to a Hair's breadth where Wonder ends, and Astonishment begins, this was reserved for the Acumen of a Rational Divine. It were tedious, though useful, no doubt, to Instance with what Dexterity they Wire-draw Discoveries out of Immutable, and Unchangeable Natures; how they call Fire out of Smoak, but never steams out of Light: At what Killing undoing Rates they Syllogize, how they run their Enemies all on Heaps, and perplex their Discourses all into Snicksnarles, but every one would Live as long as he can. This (though the better half) is but one part of that Design which he is driving on Incognito: The other is, to Besmear a sort of pittiful Fellows he has often, but never with respect, mentioned. For it's a very great Question whether he be a greater admirer of his own Excellencies, than a dispiser of other Mens Imperfections: But what is their Crime? Why they Cry down Reason for such a Prophane and Carnal thing, as must not presume to Intemeddle in Holy Matters. I have met with some who decry Carnal Reason, but never with one that affirmed Reason was Carnal: I know none that are very ambitious to put on Brute, and put off Man; and for those who are so Pelted with empty clamour, I have ever found them as much in love with, and as great Improvers of Reason as their Neighbours, only

their unhappinefs is, they have not so vast a Stock to set up with, and sometimes may be out of Sorts: However they are not ashamed to own, or disown that Thing, which many vend for reason, as it behaves it self, and for what I understand in this Matter, I shall freely confess where I had it, viz. From the Ninth Article of the Church of England, of Original or Birth sin. "This Infection of Nature doth remain, yea, in them that are Regenerated, whereby the Lust of the Flesh called in Greek, *ἐφύνημα σαρκός*, which some do Expound the Wisdom, some the Sensuality, some the Desire of the Flesh, is not subject to the Law of God. I have met also with others, who will not scruple to own, 1. That Reason is the sole and proper Judge within her own Jurisdiction, and that as we must give unto Faith the things that are Faiths, so must we yield to Reason the things that are Reasons; let her move within her own Sphere, and they will not Jostle her, nor Enterfere with her Motions. 2. They are earnest that the best Reason that can be got for Love or Money, be employed in Spinning conclusions out of those Premises which are of pure revelation, though for scanning the Truth of some propositions may be, she's not so good at it. 3. They say, that our Service and Worship of God ought to be *λογικὰ πνεύματα*, a reasonable Service; that in all our Worship of God, our Actions be under the Conduct of Reason. So Idle is our Authors reproach, that they will not allow Reason to Intermeddle in Holy Matters: Can she not meddle, but she must be Lady Paramount? Can she not look into the Temple, but she must peep into the Holy of Holies? 4. They say they never affirmed, Hot nor Cold, that Reason was

was *Carnal*; but that there is some *Carnal Reason*: That [*Carnal*] is not *Epitheton genericum*, as if all *Reason* were *Carnal*; but only *Species*, that there is such a thing as *Carnal Reason*; and they bring the Church of *England* for their *Voucher*. On the other side they do affirm, 1. That the *Reasonings of Men* as they are found in *all the Sons of Adam* are *Vitiated and Corrupted*; they cannot see how *Reason* *scaped* better in the *common Shipwreck*, than the other powers of the *Soul*. 2. Hence they put a difference betwixt *Reason* in the *abstract*, as it is in it self, and as it is found *Immersed in Matter*, and *Drenched in Hyle*; betwixt *Reason* as it ran clear at first, and as it now *tastes of the Cask*: And when the *Apostle Paul* (who passes now-a-days for an *Obscure writer*) could give us the Hint of this Difference, *Rom. 1. 21.* Ἐμαυτοῦσαν ἐν τοῖς διαλογισμοῖς αὐτῶν: They became vain in their own *Reasonings or Argumentations*, and their fool-heart was darkned. Methinks they that Trade in the *Essential differences of things*, should not have over-lookt it; but *Bernardus* *Non vidit omnia*. 3. Therefore where the *Infallible Word of God* has clearly revealed any *Doctrine*, and propounded it to their *Belief*, they look upon't as their business to *Believe*, not *Dispute*; as owning the *Reason of the Scripture*, to be the *Supreme and Sovereign reason*, which is nothing but the *Authority of an Infallible Revealer*: When therefore they cannot Grasp how some things should be, with Consistence to their apprehensions, they trouble not themselves much, but are satisfied that *Thus they are*. 4. That there are some *Doctrines* in the *Scripture* fairly laid down to be *Faith*, which yet are above the most

Exalted reason to give an account of any other way, than by Faith's Old answer to all New Objections: The Mouth of the Lord hath spoken it. 5. These men are not amended that those great Masters of Wit, should have their reason to be the common standard and Assize of the Reason of all Men, unless they can bring better Evidence that they are Clerks of the Marker, to seal all measures of Truth and Error, Good and Evil; then their new Lights hang out in Dark-Lanterns. If it come once to this, that God must not be God, unless he please their Humours: If Scriptures must pass the Ordeal of their reasons before it be Canonical, we humbly desire to be Excused, if we rather chuse to Walk alone in the Ways of Truth, than for companies-sake (as well as we love them) to be Seduced into their Misprisions.

This is the grand Crime of these men, there are others not to be despis'd. As that they argue from Fancies and Imaginations, from some pretty Allusions, Similitudes, and Allegories, which have no certain shape: Yet I am well assured, that no man was ever more firmly bounden, and indebted to an Allegory, than our Author, unless I saw him claps up for one upon Execution in the Kings-Bench. pag. 6. He did but meet with the word Salem upon the Road, and he presently spies the New Jerusalem coming down from Heaven, in it: pag. 161. He had heard, that Eve was taken out of Adams side, and he sets his Allegorical Machine a work, and hales, [the Church taken out of Christs crucified Body] Out on't. Though to Qualifie the Matter, he says it was but with a Quasi, as it were, or if he might so say; but by and by, he grows more
flesh

fleſh with Succeſs, and *Pèremptorily* concludes: That the Church is taken out of the crucified Body of Chriſt, which (ſays he) in the *Mystical ſence*, answers to the Woman being taken out of the Man; and from this pretty *Alluſion*, grounds his Interpretation of *Ephes. 5. 30. 1 Col. 2. 1. 2. 2.* Although the ſtate of Innocency had no proper inſtituted Types; however the *paſſages of Gods Providence* therein may be accommodated by the Penmen of the Holy Scriptures *Infallibly inſpired*, to *Illustrate Evangelical Verities*. But let a taſte of theſe things ſtay the Readers *Stomach* a while, and if his *Mouth waters* at ſuch Theology, he ſhall have his *Belly full*, even to Surfeit of ſuch *Luscious Allegories* in due time. Thus much to his firſt Argument, taken from the uncertainty of this way of arguing.

(2.) His ſecond Reason follows, drawn alſo from the uncertainty of this way of arguing. For thus his Argument runs: *This way of reasoning will ſerve any mans turn*: Which is nothing but the uncertainty of it, and had not our Author (who alway argues as occaſion ſerves from the *Effential differences of things*) told us it was another reason, it might have *Militated* under the colours of the former: But he puts in a *Caveat* againſt all the World but himſelf and his Brethren. For though it will ſerve any mans turn, yet you muſt always Interpret it with this reſtriction, *who have any Quickneſs and Vigour of Fancy*, which clearly cuts out all the reſt of Mankind, as ſhall appear from the Fag end of this Section.

What remains of this Diſcourſe, is laid out upon the *Equipping of another Scheme of Religion*, from an acquaintance with Chriſts Perſon: Where in
the

the *Quickness and Vigour of his Fancy*; doe Triumph. The World shall now see (I that they shall) what other-guise work our Author can make on't, when he comes to the Trimming of this Matter, than those *clumzy Fellows* ever could, who have attempted that way; and shall see that *Scanderbag's Sword and Arm* together, can work Wonders. It's ordinary to find the *Physitians Trencher* loaden with that *Meat*, which he Prohibits his *Patient* upon pain of Death. If *any else* had presum'd to have *finger'd* this Theme, he had got a *rap o' Knuckles*, and yet here we find our Author *up to the Elbows* in't. *Great Spirits* know how to give *Laws* to others, and yet *themselves* to *Live* above them. I have openly owned it, *that this Section is unanswerable*, and that my Reader may not Censure me for a *Dictator*; I am Obliged to give him an Account of the *Impregnableness* of it. The Scheme which he here presents us withal, is not supposed to be *his own Judgment*, but merely an *Imitation of other Mens way*, though the Copy out-doe the Original: If therefore any one shall Essay to Answer it, he comes over you: *I did but play the Fool, because I supposed others had done so, and I was willing to let you see, I could do it as nearly as another.* To meddle therefore with the *substrate Matter*, and main *Doltrine* thereof, would be lost Labour; to Examine whether it be *stuffe with Orthodox, or Heterodox propositions*, shall be all one to me; but one thing (I confess) I am tempted to search into (because he Boasts so highly of his Skill in it; *how easie it is to present us with many more Schemes, with fair Colours, Exalt and regular Proportions, and artificial Connexions!*) viz. Whether

ther there be that *regular proportion* betwixt his *Confidence* and his *Performance*; whether he has put such *fair Colours* upon things, but that the *Morpheu* of the skin shines through the *Cerufs*; whether his *Matters* be *Lincky* together with such *artificial connexions*? Or whether the *Sun* in the *Firmament*, and as the *Battoon* in the *Chimney corner* do not as well shake hands; that is, whether the *Wind-Mill* be not *alive* for all *Don Quixot*?

(1.) He tells us, "Since we see Christ come in the Nature and Likeness of a Man, nothing dreadful in his Countenance, having all the sweetness of Innocency, his Miracles Great and Glorious, but not Frightful and Astonishing; his Almighty Power display'd in Methods of Love and Kindness, healing the Sick, dispossessing Devils, &c. From all this we may safely Conclude, He came upon an Embassy of Peace, to assure the World of Gods good Will to them, and to Reconcile the Differences betwixt God and Man. Now for my own part, my Eyes are not a whit Dazled with the fairness of his colours, nor my Thoughts much ravish'd with the exaltness of the Symmetry of this Piece. For, 1. It's very Disproportionable to his main assertion: How unsafe and dangerous it is, to found Religion upon an acquaintance with Christs Person: Whereas in this Period, he assures us, We may safely conclude thence, that Christ was an Ambassador of Peace, that he came to reconcile the Differences betwixt God and Man. Which (I promise you) makes a shrewd Hole in Religion. 2. It bears no better proportion to its self; for I hope the Reader has not forgotten how he is Erecting a Scheme of Religion from an acquaintance with Christs Person,

not

not taking in Gospel Revelation: Now here he supposes Christ to have been the *Eternal Son of God*, leaving his *Fathers Throne*, coming into the *World*; which he could never have concluded from his *Person*; had he seen him in the *flesh*, unless the *Mystery* of it had been revealed to him from above, *Matth.* 16. 16, 17. *Thou art Christ the Son of the Living God*: Blessed art thou *Simon Bar-Jona*, for *flesh and blood* hath not revealed it to thee; but *my Father* which is in *Heaven*. 3. He pretends to gather Christ's design in coming into the *World*, from his *Person*, *Miracles*, *Behaviour*, and *sweet demeanour* towards men; yet here we want *Proportion*, if we may believe himself, *pag.* 76. "Had we seen Christ in the *flesh*, and been witnesses of the many *Miracles* he wrought, of his *Death* upon the *Cross*, and his *Resurrection* from the *dead*, had he not acquainted us with the *End* and *Design* of all this, we might have ghes'd our selves weary, and never have hit upon the right. But Now what a happy change is here? we may safely Conclude now, who could not *sorrily Ghesse* before: And here's a long stride made from one of the *Poles* of *Impossibility*, to the other of *Certainty* and *Necessity*.

"(2.) And when we consider, that this Heavenly *Ambasiadour* and *Mediator* is no less than the *Eternal Son of God*, by whom the *worlds* were made, we may reasonably conclude, that he came upon no less *Design* than of *universal Goodness*; for he can have no temptation to *partiality*, as being equally concern'd in the *Happiness* of all men; And we cannot imagine, why he should lay a narrower *Design* of *Love* in the *Redemption*, than in the *Creation* of *Mankind*, &c. Here are *proportions*

tions indeed; but whether justifiable by the *Rules of Vitruvius*, or the *Propositions of Euclide*, is more dubious: The proportion fancied here is, betwixt Christs coming, his manner of coming, and universal Redemption. Now to justify the regularity of his Superstructure upon its Foundation, he offers us several things. As, 1. That Christ came upon a design of Universal Goodness: Well, but it must be equal Goodness to do his Business. 2. He says, Christ can have no temptation to Partiality: True, but differing Kindnesses where none are due, may consist very well with Impartiality: That he shewed Kindness to any, was more than he owed them, that he vouchsafed more to some than others, was no wrong to the rest. They who have the benefit, must ascribe all to his Grace; they who are left in the same plight their own sins had brought them into, have no cause to complain. 3. He goes a step higher in his Proportions: Christ was equally concerned in the Happiness of all men. And this he gathers reasonably from the Behaviour of Christ towards the World. But I doubt he has taken false measures of Christs concernment for mens Happiness: The best way, I should think, would be to view how he carried it towards them with whom he did converse; and there are some shrewd suspicions, that he was not so equally concern'd, for we read *Joh. 17. 9* that there were some he prayed for, and others for whom he prayed not; some to whom he immediately dispatcht his saving Gospel, others to whom he at present suspended that Favour, *Matth. 10. 5*. Goe not into the way of the Gentiles, and into any City of the Samaritans enter ye not, but goe rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel: Nay in *Fall* it's clear, he

tent

sent not his Gospel to all places of the habitable World equally, to some sooner, to others later; with some it continued longer; with other Nations less while; to some it was preach'd in more purity, cleanness and power, to others with less: And if he sent it not at the same minute to every individual Person, it will not argue an equal Concernment in the Salvation of all men; for it's possible thousands might, and certain thousands, and ten thousands dyed in Ignorance, or (as our Author expresses it, pag. 30.) under Gods ineffectual Wayes, before the Gospel came unto them: and if this Gospel stayed a day longer in one Nation than another, still here's no equal concernment for the Salvation of all; for what becomes then of those poor Wretches, who without any fault of theirs (let me borrow an Expression from our Author) were left out of Gospel times, because their Fathers had eaten sowre Grapes, and now the childrens teeth are set on edge. 4. But he assigns a Reason of all this, wherein we hope to find more exact Proportions: "We cannot imagine why he should lay a Narrower design of Love in the Redemption, than in the Creation of Mankind. That when in the first Creation he design'd all men for Happiness, in this New and Second Creation he should design onely the Happiness of some few; which is to make him less good in Redeeming than in Creating Mankind. The summe of it is thus much: Christ Redeemed all that he Created; but he Created all men, therefore he Redeemed all men: And he cannot Imagine how it should be otherwise. But, 1. Leave out that one word [Mankind,] and let the Proposition reach all rational and intellectual Creatures, made capable of Everlasting Happiness, and

and then let him try how his *Proportions* will fadge: We cannot Imagine how *Creating Love*, and *Redeeming Love* should be of different *Latitudes*; why in the first *Creation* he should design the *Happiness* of all his *Creatures* capable thereof, and yet in the *Second* and *New Creation*, leave out some, and take others into his favour. The *Creating Love* of *Christ* was extended to *Angels*, he made them *glorious Spirits*, and had *Christ* been tempered to *Partiality*, was he less concerned for their *Happiness*, than that of poor men? Did he lay a *Narrower design* of Love in *Redeeming* his *capable Creatures*, than in their *Creation*? Or why in the first and *Old Creation* did he design *Angels* for *Happiness*, and yet in the *Second* and *New Creation* design the *Happiness* only of *Mankind*? One *Angel* might have done *Christ* more *Service*, brought him more *glory*, than a thousand such wretched *Worms* as *Man*. And yet not one *Angel* recovered, not one *fallen Spirit* raised, redeemed, and brought back to its *Original Happiness*.

2. What he therefore addes, is most *Vain*, that this would make him less good in *Redeeming* than in *Creating*, though *Creation* cost him no more than the *Exercise* of his *Power*, but *Redemption* the *Expence* of his *Blood*. For, 1. One *Soul* redeemed argues more Love than many created, which is proved by that very Reason which our Author has brought to overthrow it; because, to *Redeem* one *Soul*, cost more than to create many. But, 2. What warrant he has to measure betwixt *Redeeming Love*, and *Creating Love*, I cannot tell; This I know, they are both beyond our reach; yet I think, that the *Blood of Christ* as a *Man*, separated from that consideration of it as *satisfactory* to *Gods Justice*, cannot be said to be

of

of more worth or dignity than the *Creating Power* of God. But to conclude, God made *Man* righteous, there was his *Creating Love*; he qualified him thus made, for the *Service* and *Enjoyment* of his *Maker*; If now he shall voluntarily loose his *firmness*, and leave his relation to God, and thereby make himself lyable to the *Curse*; whenever this *Creator* shall please to undertake a *Recovery*, I suppose he may (without impeachment of *Partiality*) do with his own *Grace* what he pleases, and bestow it where he pleases, and not fear to be called to Account by every *Malapert Caviller*. And Now he clenches the *Nail* with a *sure stroke*. No sure, his *Goodness* did not become less infinite and boundless, when he became *Man*. This is indeed somewhat *Amazing*, for how to find out the *Proportion*, the exact and regular proportion betwixt a greater and lesser *Infinite*, may puzzle our brains as much as to find out the just proportion betwixt finite and infinite; which when it shall be made out, will doubtless equal the invention of that *Proposition* in *Euclide* which deserved a *Hecatomb*. In pag. 208. he tells us, *Though God be rich in Mercy*, yet he never told us that he was bottomless and boundless. And if God be not a God of bottomless and boundless *Mercy*, it will not bear a regular proportion to enquire, *Whether Christs Goodness became less Infinite and boundless than it was before*.

(3.) He considers, "The Holiness and Innocence of Christs Life, that he was a great Example of unaffected Piety towards God, &c. Hence does he reasonably conclude, that he came to restore the Practice of Piety, &c. which had been banisht out of the world by the hypocritical pretences of

" 3

" a more Refined Sanctity, in washing of Hands and
 " Dishes, in tything Mint and Cummin, (*as he calls*
it.) Now this is to be fear'd, is not *very regular*
 and exact; for some would conclude, as if Christ
 came to destroy the *Jus Divinum* of Tythes; but
 we are to understand, that *the Venome and Villany*
 of this Hypocrisie did not lye in Tything *Egges, or*
Pigs, Chickens, Ducks, or Goslings, Apples, Pears,
or Plumbs, much less those fatter *Predial Revenues*
of the Church; but only in those *uncanonical things,*
Mint, Annise, Cummine; and bate but those two
 or three, and Tythes are *Sacred* out of all things,
 from the *Cedar in Lebanon* to the *Hyssop upon the*
Wall.

(4.) " Our Saviour by his Example as well as
 " Laws, taught us Another Lesson, that as we lost
 " our Happiness at first by Sin, so the way to re-
 " gain the Favour of God, and an Immortal Life, is
 " by the practice of a Sincere and Universal Righte-
 " ousness. I must freely confess, I would never de-
 sire any man to be more ridiculous whilest I live,
 than our Author in these few words: If he has *for-*
got his design, or lost himself in a Wood, yet does he
 presume the Reader also has *his wits gone after him*
a Wooll-gathering: He has pretended over and over,
 that he would give us *Another Scheme of Religion*
from acquaintance with Christs Person, more *beau-*
tifull for Colour, more *exact for Proportion* than
 what all other men have been able to shew, and all
 this *without Gospel-Revelation;* And yet here con-
 trary to all the *Laws of Proportion,* he takes in
Christs Laws, from which we must learn *this other*
Lesson; but though *his Laws* came in by an *Ano-*
maly, surely *his Example* is *Regular;* and that teaches

us, that *The way to regain Gods Favour, is by the practice of a sincere and universal Righteousness.* Now if Christ has taught us *this* by his Example; we must suppose that He had *once lost Gods Favour*, but happily *regain'd it* by this Expedient of a *sincere and universal Righteousness*. Whether this be a *Truth* or no in it self, is out of our Charter to examine; for we are obliged onely to consider the *Regularity of his Proportions*, and the *self-consistency of his Notions*.

(5.) "When We remember that Christ died as a Sacrifice, and Propitiation for sin, this gives Us a great demonstration of Gods good will to us, how ready he is to pardon former sins, in that he hath appointed an Atonement for us, and given no less a Person than his own Son for our Ransome. It's very strange, that none else may be allowed to gather all this from the Revelation of the Gospel; and yet our Author, with his Scrues of Artificial Connexions and Regular Proportions, can draw it, every Letter and Syllable, from an Acquaintance with Christs Person: But by what secret wayes he became Master of this Mystery, is to me a greater mystery: How the Person of Christ, the Death of Christ, should teach us the proper Ends and Designs of his Death, unless he had Acquainted us with them, I am yet to seek, and so was our Author himself within these few leaves, pag. 78. The Incarnation, and Life, and Death, and Resurrection of Christ, were available to those Ends for which God designed them; but the Virtue and Efficacy of them doth depend upon Gods Institution and Appointment, and therefore can be known onely by Revelation.

(6.) He

(6.) He assures us, "That the Death of Christ assures him of the Desert of Sin, and what it is. And I am heartily glad to hear the News, and wish it had been attended with *Proof from Scripture*, which is *pregnant* in it, and not *shuffled off* with that which is next dore to none. Surely then there was somewhat in the Death of Christ which Answer'd the Demerit of it, which was, Gods Anger and Displeasure against it; or it will be impossible from Christs Death to leath Sins Demerit, without a Scripture-Comment upon the Text of his Crosse and Sufferings.

(7.) "Christs Death seals the irrevocable Decree of Reprobation. That's a terrible News as the other was comfortable; but I fear he must be beholden to the Gospel for his Intelligence, or he will never learn it from a bare acquaintance with Christs Person. And now we may fairly presume there is such a Decree, so irrevocable, so immuable, else how does the Death of Christ seal it? It's supposed ever, that the Decree is made, ere it be sealed; but the vigour and quickness of our Authors Fancy is incredible; and so at length, those poor wretches whose hard Fortune it was (in our Authors phrase) to be left out of the Roll of Election, without any fault of theirs, are in the same Predicament they were in before.

Our Author has reserved one thing for the shutting up of this Section, which being a matter of very great importance, and yet so easie and accountable, we may not doubt but he has handled it with much Exactness: It is the True Method of a Sinners Recovery by Christ. From hence (says he) it's easie to understand what is the True Method of a Sinners

Recovery by Christ. And there are two parts of his *Undertaking*. 1. The Erecting of his own regular and exact *Method*. 2. The demolishing the confused *Method* of others.

And, (First,) For his own *Method*, (for so he is pleas'd to Nick-name it, for divers good and valuable Considerations him thereunto especially moving,) it is no more but this: *When we are so affected with all the powerfull Arguments to a New Life, which are contained in his [Christ's] Incarnation, and Life, and Doctrine, and Example, and Miracles, and Death, and Resurrection, and Ascension into Heaven, and his Intercession for us, as to be sensible of the Shame and Folly of Sin, and to be reconciled to the Love and Practice of true Piety and Holiness; Then—* What then? O then, we partake in the Merits of His Sacrifice, and find the benefit of his Intercession, and have A Title to all the Blessings and Promises of the Gospel. This is the True Method of a Sinners Recovery: But still I doe not see the Regular Proportion of it to his Design; for, as has been oft observed, he pretends to give us a Scheme of Religion from the Person of Christ, never meddling with his Doctrine; and yet now when he thinks it so easie to give us from thence, a Method of a Sinners Recovery, he is glad to be beholden to the Doctrine of Christ; for he sayes, *When we are so affected with all the Arguments to a New Life, which are contained in Christ's Incarnation, and Life, and Doctrine, &c.* It seems there are not Arguments enough in his Person, but we must run to his Doctrine for a Recruit, and what's become then of his specious Promise, that he would out-throw all that ever tried

tryed before him, in making *Schemes of Religion from Acquaintance with his Person*; The *veriest Bungler* on Earth could but have contradicted himself; but I wish that were the worst on't. For, 1. Some cannot see any Method at all in it. But to be recovered is the Method of being Recovered; to be converted, is the way to be converted; and that's a very sure way, I promise you; for *Omne quod est in quantum est, Necessè est esse*: But this one of his peculiar Excellencies; p. 18. *The way to be perfect, is to live as Christ lived*; or which is all one, *The way to be perfect, is to be perfect*: If any one can make any better of this, he shall have my free leave: When we are so affected with all the powerfull Arguments contained in *Christs Incarnation, &c.* as to be sensible of the shame and folly of sin, and to be reconciled to the love and practice of true Piety, and Holiness; Then — The English of which is this: When we are once holy, then we are holy. And this is his New way or Method of a Sinners Recovery by Christ. But, 2. We have been made to believe hitherto, That *Method*, is a convenient sorting and marshalling of Matters which relate each to other, into such an Order, as may tend best to the reaching the End in practical Disciplines, and making out the Truth in Theories: But herein our Author is wretchedly out of the way: For first he tells us, we must be so affected with all the powerfull Arguments contained in *Christs Intercession, &c.* and then we partake in the Merits of his Sacrifice, and find the Benefit of his Intercession for us. That is, we must set the Cart before the Horses, which is an excellent Method; Seeing we cannot partake of the Fruit of *Christs Intercession*, before we partake of the Fruits

of his Sacrifice; for it is unquestionable, that the Intercession of Christ is available by virtue of, and operates by his Sacrifice. 3. His Method is very lame upon this Account, that he tells us we must be affected with all the powerfull Arguments contained in Christs Incarnation, &c. and yet never tells us, how these Arguments become effectual to affect us, which is a main thing in this Method. A Method he supposes, and yet never informs us, whether it be openly a way that God prescribes us to recover our selves by, using the best of our own Natural strength, or whether it be Gods Way and Method which he proceeds in, for the effectual recovery of a Sinner to himself. 4. Here's a Method pretended, how a Sinner is recovered, and yet no Consideration had, what part and share the Holy Spirit bears in it, which must needs be marvellously ridiculous to him that considers, John 3. 5, 6. *Except a man be born again, of Water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of Heaven.* Our Saviour had said, v. 3. *Except a man be born again, he cannot see the Kingdom of God;* but not contenting himself to have shew'd, how absolutely necessary Regeneration is to Salvation; v. 5. he shews the Spirits concernment in that work, and that all other Endeavours after Conversion without his powerfull Operations, will amount to no more than flesh; *The streams will not rise higher than the Spring.* V. 6. *That which is born of the Flesh is Flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is Spirit:* But yet, 5. It's equally absurd to speak of a Sinners Recovery, and never shew from what he is recovered; As if he should promise to Open to us the Nature of Motion, and yet never shew us from whence the Motion takes its rise, nor whither

whither it tends. Sinners are here talk'd of, to be recovered, but whether there be a *State of corrupt and sinfull Nature*, a *state of Enmity against God*, a *state of blindness and darkness of Mind*, from which this Recovery must move; we are not honoured with half a word. 6. Here's a recovery to *Acts of Obedience*, love, and practice of Piety, but nothing of a *New Heart*, a *New Nature*, which the Scripture makes the *Vital Principle* of all *New Obedience*; Here we are told a little of the *Fruit the Tree brings forth*, but nothing how the *Tree was made good*, that it might bring forth good Fruit. 7. He assigns a *sensibleness of the Shame and Folly of Sin*, as the *Means* to get a *Title* to the *Promises of the Gospel*, and yet some of those *Promises* contain an *Engagement* of God to give that *New heart*, new *Spirit*, which he makes the *Condition* of obtaining a *Title* to the *Promises*. Ezek. 36. 26. *I will take away the heart of Stone out of your flesh, and I will give you a heart of Flesh.* I am perswaded, that if we should all study seven years to be Impertinent and Ridiculous, there are not many that could reach, or equallize our Authors Attainments.

(Secondly,) The other part of his Task, wherein he is always most Admirable, is, *To pluck down those Methods which others have, or are supposed to have Built.* And 'tis certainly an easier province to find faults, than to amend them. Now first, he enlightens us with this Doctrine: That the design of *Christs coming into the World*, was not to distract mens minds with the *Terrors of the Law*, and the *Inexorable Justice of God*, not to bring us under a *Legal Dispensation of Fear and Bondage*: Now all the Colour of this trifling Sophistry lies in two

things. 1. In putting in the word [*Distract*] to make his *Negative* seem *Tenable*: For though Christ came to *Humble*, to *Abase*, to *Awaken* the guilty *Consciences* of sinners, yet it would be hard to say, he came to *frighten* men out of their *Wits*, to prepare men for *Bedlam*, and the slipping in *such an useful word*, will make a *Negative* justifiable upon any of the *Designs* of Christ: But can sinners be more *Mad* than they are, who go on securely in a state of *Impenitency*, and *Rebellion* against God? No sure: That which some call *distracting* of sinners, is but really a step towards the *helping* of them to their *Wits*. 2. The *Design* of Christ's coming into the World is either *Subordinate*, which relates still to some further end and design of Christ, or *Ultimate* to which all others do *submit*, and give *deference*. Now 'tis true, To *awaken* guilty *Consciences* with the *Terrors* of Gods *Justice*, to bring the Soul into a *spirit* of *Bondage*, were not that which Christ did aim at as his *great End*, but that he aimed at these things also in the way to his farthest End: That is, he *used* the *Law* to *rouse* the *sleepy sinner* to see his danger, and provide for his safety: He *wounded* men that they might *seek* after healing; and *laid* load upon their guilty minds, that they might be content to *take* his *Toke* upon them. And that this is so: 1. We have an *Argument*, which is, *Inftar omnium*, a *Thousand Reasons* by it self: That is what our Author says; *That we must be affected with all the Arguments of Christ's Incarnation, &c. so as to be sensible of the shame and folly of our sins*. Now how a man should be *ashamed of sin*, till he sees its *vileness* and *baseness*; and how he should see its *vileness* and *filthiness*, till its brought

to the Test of Gods Holy Law, which is the Rule of righteousness, the Measure of Good and Evil; is past my Conjecture. Nay further, that Shame which fills a Soul, does not merely arise from a sense of the Souls *vileness*; but as compared with Gods Holiness, who is a God so Pure, so Holy, &c. that the Soul may well be *ashamed*, and filled with Confusion of face, to appear before him. Now shame upon the account of the *filthiness*; and dread upon the account of the *guilt of sin*, are very near Neighbours: Shame expresses the Souls sense of its own unworthiness to appear before God, upon the score of its baseness and deformity; and Fear expresses but the sense of Gods Authority, which he hath Impressed, and Stampd upon his Holy Law, with the Souls reflection upon it self, that it has violated that Law, and thereby become liable to that Penalty which his own guilt has bound him over to. And this was clear in Adams case: He was Naked, and therefore *ashamed*; he was guilty, and therefore feared to appear before this Holy God, and Just Judge. Now our Author will allow it lawful to fetch Arguments from Christs Incarnation, Life, Doctrine, Death, and what you please, to make us *ashamed of sin*, but by no means to be afraid of the Great God: But the very truth is, none say, that it is the duty of Men to be Distracted, and Unhinged in mind with slavish fears, and Hellish apprehensions of Gods Justice: But that this Dread may possibly run up some poor Creatures so high, as to a literal distraction, when the apprehensions of the Curse due to the Transgression of a righteous Law, of a Holy, and Jealous God, shall overset a weak Judgement, and dark Mind, that sees its danger,

ger, but no way to escape; sees its *Disease*, but not its *Cure*; its *sin* with the *demerits* thereof, but not a *Saviour* with his *Merits*, and at once considers that *Wrath of God* which it concludes to be *unavoidable*, and knows to be *Intollerable*. 3. That our Saviour did use the *Law*, and its *Terrors*, to awaken the Souls of men to a due apprehension of their sin, and their danger thereupon, the whole Tenour of the New Testament prove: It was the Method of his Precursor, *John the Baptist*, he laid this Ax to the Root of the Tree, *Mat. 3. 10.* denouncing against them, *That every Tree that brought not forth good Fruit, should be hewen down, and cast into the fire.* And where ever the *Pharisees* got it, yet a warning they had got to *shie from wrath to come.* The Apostle *Paul* both felt it, and *Preacht* the use of the *Law* for Conviction of sin, with all its Consequents; and leading the sinner to *Christ*: He felt it, *Rom. 7. 9.* *When the Commandment came, sin revived, and I died;* he saw himself a *dead and lost man*, He *Preacht* also the Use of the *Law*, *Gal. 3. 24.* to be a *Schoolmaster to bring us to Christ.* What use our Saviour in his own Person made of the *Law*, may be seen from *Matth. 5.* and also *chap. 23.* where he thunders upon the dead and secure Consciences of Sinners, with *Arguments* taken from the *Law of God*, and the *dreadfull Curse* annex'd to the violation of it. And though our Author will allow no more than an *Awfull* regard and reverence for God, who is a *holy and righteous Judge*, and an *irreconcilable Enemy* to all *Sin*; yet when a Sinner shall be thoroughly convinc'd that he is so, and shall know that the wages of *Sin* is *Death*, and that he that gave forth this *Law*, and must sit in *Judgement* upon

upon him, is both a *Holy* and a *Righteous Judge*, and an *irreconcilable Enemy* to all *Sin*, there will be more than an awfull regard and reverence for this God; unless he have the faculty to tell a Sinner how he may stand guilty before his Judgement-Seat, and not be filled with horror and unspeakable amazement. But I see our Author can be both more severe than Christ, where his severity is *not due*, and more mercifull too at other times, when his Clemency will *destroy*: He will *dawb over* the chinks of their Consciences with *untemper'd Mortar*, and *skin over* their wounds very smoothly; he will not have men feel the workings of the Law, nor any amazing terrors of Gods wrath. Though it be hard to conceive how a Soul should see *Sin*, and not see *Gods wrath*; or seeing it, not be terrified, and amazed with it: But such was not the Way and Method, nor such the End and Design of Christs coming; He never preach'd Peace, when Destruction was nigh; he accommodated not his Doctrine to the Lufts and Tempers of Sinners, but Acted according to his Commission, *Isa. 61. 1, 2. Preaching the Acceptable year of the Lord, and the day of vengeance of our God.* But our Author has imposed it upon himself, as his constant Method, to discourse *pro re natâ*, to fit the present purpose; for pag. 3. of this excellent Piece, he had told us, *That the Gospel of Christ is as severe a Dispensation as the Law, which dooms men to Eternal misery, that live not very vertuous and innocent Lives: And they must be very vertuous and innocent ones indeed, who escape that doom, for just now he assures us, That God is a righteous Judge, and an irreconcilable Enemy to all sin.*

After

After all this storm, there are yet a few drops behind, which we may do well to shelter our selves from, if we can: He falls into some heat against our *having Christ offer'd to us to be our Saviour*; against the *Beseechings of Christ*; against *Covenanting with Christ*; which is well express'd by *Contract and Espousal*: And for this there is good warrant, 2 Cor. 5. 20. *As though God did beseech you by us, we pray you (in Christs stead) be ye reconciled to God.* This was Scripture before he was born, and will be so when he is gone; and therefore he may speak his pleasure against Christ, and his Gospel; But he has a License, and let him make the best on't: for our parts, we hope we shall not be Scoffed out of the Concernments of our Souls, and Salvation; and if that must Anger him, let him repeat over the *Alphabet*, or which will do as well, Turn the *Knot of his Girdle behind him.*

To conclude; the Persons whom our Authors lot is fallen out to reproach, Doe build their Faith, Hope, and Expectations upon God through Christ; The Knowledge of all which, they owe alone to the Scriptures, given forth by the Inspiration of the Holy Ghost: The *Supposition* therefore that our Author has proceeded upon all this while, is a *meer Falshood*; yet had it been *True* what he charges them with, he had *very weakly* overthrown their Error; and none can doe greater *diservice* to the Truth, than by a *weak and feeble defence* of it, or a *weak Opposition* to the contrary; it's enough to tempt some men to take up what he opposes, and to presume there are *no better Arguments* one way or other, because so confident a Designer could give *no better*: For all the Misadventures

ventures in his Tedious Scheme, he will make us believe he's not bound to answer for them; for if the *Proportions* be but *regular*, let the Doctrine be what it will, he does but personate the Mode of others: But yet we have discover'd here many of his own dear *Notions*, sent abroad in *Masquerade*, which will appear more bare-faced in the following sheets; Imitating herein the famous Limner, who would stand behind his Exposed Piece, to Eaves-drop the Censure of the Critical Spectator; Just thus does our Author skulk behind his *New Model of Divinity*, and if it meets with an *Imprimatur*, he will play a more Overt Game; but if otherwise, he can quickly pluck in his Horns.

CHAP.

CHAP. III. Sect. 4.

*How Men Pervert the Scriptures, to make it
Comply with their own Fancies.*

IT's storied of *Messa la Corvinus*, (once a Famous Orator) that he got such a Crack in his Pericranium, that he quite forgot his own Name; the most unhappy man, certainly, in all the World, to have been Employed in the Management of a *Lye*; the Mystery whereof consists mainly in Ty-ing both the Ends so handsomely together, that it may not Ravel out into Thrums. Our Author has Managed a severe Charge against some, that they Deduce all their Religion from an acquaintance with Christs Person, without consulting the Scriptures: And yet now, The truth is (says he) if you consult their Writings, you will find them stuffed with Scriptures. These things did not Cotten very Lovingly, and he was as much put to his Trumps to make both ends meer; as the Gentleman, who told it with great Confidence, That he shot a Deer with one Arrow through the right Ear, and the left Foot behind. But he has an old Friend, that never fails his Servants at a Pinch, and he lifted him over the Style with this: They do but accommodate Scriptures to their own Fancies. Their Crime then in the last Result, is this: That they are not so happy Interpreters of Scripture as himself: They have the same

Text,

Text, but they want his Head-piece to Comment on't: They have the *same Materials* to work upon, but they want *his Tools*: Or (as one of his Friends expres'd it) they have *his Fiddle*, but cannot get *his Fiddle-stick*. But to reproach them upon this Account, is to reproach (by far) the greatest part of Mankind. All were not Born under his *smiling Stars*, nor had the *same benign Aspects of the Planets* in their *Nativity*: It's not every mans happiness, to have the *Bees swarm* about his *Cradle*, or to be entranced upon the *Top of Parnassus*: However (after all the Scuffle) we have gain'd this *Point*, that we may joyn Issue with him upon the *Question*, and modestly Debate it, Whether *he* or *they* do best understand the *Scriptures*?

Two great Faults (and they are great ones indeed) he finds in their Writings: First, That *they Expound Scripture by the sound of Words*. And secondly, That *they reason about the Sense of Scripture, from their own preconceived Notions*.

[1.] They *Expound Scripture by the sound of words*. Our Author had discovered to us, p. 80. the *Danger of using a way of Reasoning that would serve any Mans turn, that had but any Quickness and Vigour of Fancy*. What a dangerous way then must this be, that will serve any Mans turn, though he be not blessed with *his Quickness and Vigour of Fancy*! For though his Antagonists *Pulse* toll as heavily as *Tom of Lincoln*, though he never drew *his Breath* but in *Boetia*, nor ever had his *Temples* crown'd with the *Ignis Lambens*, yet he can with as much ease, and more truth, Retort all his *Rhetorick*. When mens *Fancies* are so possessed with *Schemes and Ideas of Religion*, what ever they look upon,

upon appears of the same shape and colour, wherewith their Minds are already Tintur'd; like a Man sick of the Jaundies, or that looks through painted Glass, who seeth every thing of the same colour that his Eye or the Glass gives it. Some such Medium, the poor Priest used to Prove, that the *Virgin Mary* was Propheesied of, from the beginning of the World; because he had made a shift to read, *Gen. 1. 10. Congregationem aquarum vocavit Maria*: And with the same learned skill did the Rector of — Convince his obstinate Parishioners, that it was their Duty to Pave his Chancel for him; from *Paveam illi, ego non Pavebo*. And let me tell our Author, for all his *Vapouring*, and that he looks so goodly on't, he has not a more serviceable Engine than this one, in all his Arsenal. For having once double-dyed his Fancy with a strong Conceit, that the word [*Christ*] signifies a Church, an Office, a Doctrine; you cannot Quote that Text, where the Word occurs, but his Fancy Chimes all in; just as Imagination thinks, so Scripture clinks; and every thing he sees, turns round to that Crotchet, when all the while the Wind-Mill is in his own Head. If you should but venture to say, that for an Orator, our Author is truly excellent; but for a Logician, he is but Ordinary. Il'e undertake from the sound of that one word, he shall conceit himself at first Dash, to be a Bishop. So easie it is for a French Cook to make *Suffolk-street Soupe*, of a *Stool-foot*; and most Ravishing *Minc't- Pie's*, of an Old Boot-top, or a Leather Doublet.

As it is a Ridiculous procedure, to make the sound of words the Measure of our Interpretation, so is it no less perverse a Method, to Expound Scripture

ture by the *Ranverse*, and go just cross to the *sound of words*. The *Plain and Literal* sence commands our Reception; unless the *Context and Coherence*, *Evident contradiction* to some other *plain Scripture*, or some *gross Absurdity*, and *insuperable Difficulty*, compell us to Recede from it. But now according to our Authors *Rule* (which he has *most Religiously* observed throughout his Book) the further any Interpretation departs from the *sound of words*, the better it is, that is to say, for his own purpose. As suppose you should meet with this word [*Heaven,*] let not the *Chiming, and Tinckling of your Fancy*, betray you into a Notion of some *Glorious place*, where the *Spirits of Just men made perfect*, are Blessed in the enjoyment of God; for that would be but to Gratifie your *Tinctured Imagination*, with the *sound of a word* that Rhimes pretty well to your own Conceits: But rather work up your Imagination to the prospect of some dreadful Dungeon, where nothing but Ratling of Chains, Blowing of Bellows, Hissing of Serpents, and the Yellings of Griefly-people strike a Horror into your Mind; and then to be sure you shall purchase our Authors good word, and never be Taxed for Interpreting by the *Sound and Clink of words*. Thus if you meet with that Expression [*the Son of God,*] be sure you do not understand a *Person, but a Thing*; and if at the long Run, you should chance to Interpret it into *No thing*, it will do *best of all*; For then you may lay your Life on't, you have not *Interpreted Scripture by the sound of words*.

Now as much as our Author pleases himself with his Humour in this thing, the truth is, he did but Steal, (or to make the best on't) Borrow it from

one of those he hopes to wound with it: And well might the Eagle sigh, to see her self shot through with a Dart, which had borrowed its Feathers from her own Wing. I will only burden him with one Passage: The Papists having bawled that monstrous Figment of Transubstantiation, upon the discovery of any Expressions amongst the Antients, (though made use of to another end) cry out, and Triumph, as if they had found the whole Fardel of the Mass, in its perfect Dress, and their Breaden God in the midst of it: Just so (says he) it is in the case of Episcopacy, Men of these latter Generations, from what they saw in being, and the usefulness of it to their Desires and Interests, searching Antiquity, not to Instruct them in the Truth, but to Establish their Opinion, whatever Expressions they find that fall in as to the sound of Words, with what is now Insisted on, instantly they cry out, Vicinus Iō Pœan. And now either our Authors guilty Conscience, or his Acumen, will tell him to whom he stands Indebted, for Observing to him the Danger of Interpreting by the sound of words: And let him take this Caution along with him, to forbear using that way of Reasoning, which serves any mans turn as well as (and most mens better than) his own.

It will be now time to descend to Particulars, that we may reduce his Rule into Practice: And he has singled out these Expressions, of knowing Christ, Christ's being made Wisdom to us. Having the Son. To give us an Experiment what Wonders his Rule will work.

And, (1.) For the *Knowing of Christ*. They that Interpret Scripture by the sound of words, Interpret-

terpret the Phrase; of *Knowing his Person, and all his Personal Excellencies, and Beauties, Fulness, and Preciousness, &c.* And so has the Expression been used, *John 17. 3. This is Life eternal to know thee, the only True God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent.* Where the Person of the Messiah, under that Personal Excellency of being sent of God, Anointed, and Appointed by him to Reveal, and procure Eternal Life, is made the Object of our Knowledge, Again, *John 1. 33. I knew him not, but he that sent me to Baptize with Water, the same said unto me, upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending, the same is He; and I saw, and bare Record, that [this is the Son of God.]* Where to Know Christ, is Interpreted by knowing Him to be the Son of God: And all the fault of this Interpretation is, that it comes a little too near the sound of words. But that Learned Doctors practical Interpretations, who interpreted Jesus by Judas, would have pleased our Author infinitely, because it was more modest, and durst not come so near the sound of the word. Well, But how does the Man himself expound the Phrase? Nay, as to that, he is in a brown study, and says never a word; and that I assure you is a safe way to avoid the Odium of Expounding it, by the sound of words.

But, (2.) Christ is said, *1 Cor. 1. 30. To be made Wisdom to us.* And amongst many others, I find Beza thus expounding it: *Datus est nobis a Deo, ut in ipso omnem sapientiam consequeremur (quæ quidem eo nomine verè digna sit) quum in Uno, possumus Deum, & ejus Arcana contemplari, quæ ne suspicari quidem unquam tantissimi homines potuerant.* "He is given to us of God, that in him we

"might attain Wisdom (that truly deserves the
 "Name) seeing that in Him alone, we may behold
 "God, and his Secrets, which the most discerning
 "Men otherwise could never have Ghesſed at. Let
 this Interpretation (because it comes too near the
 ſound of words) only ſerve for a Foyle, to ſet off
 the Luſtre of our Author: Some duller men (ſays
 he) can underſtand no more by it, than the Wiſdom
 of thoſe Revelations Chriſt hath made of Gods Will
 to the World. But I fear it's more their Sullenneſs
 than their Dulneſs, that they can ſee no more of
 Wiſdom in Chriſt, than a meer Revelation of Gods
 Will. For had they not worn *Racovian Spectacles*,
 they might have ſeen Satisfaction to Divine Juſtice
 in his Death, as well as a Declaration of Gods Will
 to us, iſſuing from his Mouth.

But then, (3.) Here's another great Controverſie,
 What [having of the Son] ſhould ſignifie? But
 before we fall upon that, we muſt deliver our ſelves
 from an *Ambuſcado*, ſecretly laid for our utter
 Ruine: When men have Learnt (ſays he) from an
 acquaintance with Chriſt, to place all their hopes of
 Salvation in a Personal Union with Chriſt, &c.
 He might for his Credits-ſake, have produced his
Vouchers, to make good his Charge: I do indeed
 believe, that as the *Perſon of the Husband* is re-
 lated to the *Perſon of the Wife*, and yet there is no
 personal Union made, though they are one *Fleſh*,
 yet they continue two diſtinct *Perſons*, or *Subſi-
 ſtences*; ſo Chriſt and Believers are *Perſonally* re-
 lated each to other in the *Covenant of Grace*, and
 are one *Myſtical Body*, one Spirit; and yet they
 are not taken into *Personal Union* with Chriſt. Nay,
 our Authors Conſcience was *faſt aſleep*, when he
 wrote

wrote this Twang: For, pag. 198. He Quotes these words from Doctor Jacomb; *This Mystical Union is an Union of Persons, but yet no Personal Union*; And if our Author know not how to Distinguish these two Expressions, he's sadly Accounted to Manage this Controversie. And being now freed from all Danger in the Rear, let us Advance to the Question. What this [having of the Son] should mean? 1 John's. 12. *He that hath the Son hath Life, and he that hath not the Son hath not Life.* Now the clearest way to resolve this Doubt that I can think on at present, is to Examine, *who, or what,* is meant by the Son; and when we have Settled and well Fixt the Notion of *that*, to try what further Light we may get into the Phrase of *Having the Son*: For the former, *Who or what* the Son is? I know no more Hopeful and Promising way, than to look into the Chapter, to see if peradventure the Apostle has fixt the Notion for us. And ver. 5. we read, *Who is he that overcometh the World, but he that believeth that [Jesus is the Son of God?]* And, ver. 6. *This is he that came by Water, and by Blood, even Jesus Christ.* Ver. 9: *This is the Witness of God, which he hath Testified of his Son.* And, ver. 10. *He that believeth on the Son of God, hath the Witness in himself.* And, ver. 11. *This is the Record, that God hath given to us Eternal Life, and this Life is in his Son.* And then follows the words under Examination: *He that hath the Son hath Life.* I conclude then, that if by [Son,] ver. 5, 6, 9, 10. &c. he meant the *very Son of God*, our Lord Jesus Christ; then by Son, in ver. 12. is meant the *very self same Person*. And I am the more Confirm'd in my Opinion, because our Author, p. 104. will

not allow any to separate a single Sentence from the Body of the Discourse, to make the Scripture speak their own sense. Though I confess he intended it as a Caution to others that they may avoid it, but a Canon to himself, that he might observe it: What to others was set up for a Buoy, to discover a Rock; to himself is hung out for a Lantborn, to discover his way: But I shall take his Caution, and charitably believe so well of the Apostles sincerity and judiciousness in Discourse, that he would not speak of one thing in one Verse, and another in the next, under the same words, without sufficient intimation of his Intention. But now for [having the Son of God] that is the remaining enquiry: Now in this our Author speaks more Truth than he is aware of: *What can [having the Son] signifie (says he) but having an Interest in Him? Being made one with Him, especially when we remember, that it is called [being in Christ] and [abiding in him] which must signifie a very near Union between Christs Person and ours? It must so! If [the Son] signifie the very Son of God, we must have Him, as he is capable of being had; and that's only by Interest and Propriety, through Compact agreement, and the Constitution of God in a Gospel Covenant. Ay, but (says our Author) Some will be so Perverse as to understand it of believing, and Obeying his Gospel. Well, and if they will be so Perverse without a Reason, we shall take the freedom to be as Perverse as they can be, and believe no more than we have proof for. But let us practise with his Gloss a little: By the Son, he understands the Gospel, and then his Paraphrase of v. 3. will run thus smoothly: *Who is he that overcometh the World, but he that believeth that Jesus is the**

the Gospel; that is, he that believes a Lye, he is the man that *overcomes the World*. Ay but we must remember that by *Jesuu*, he has understood the Gospel also; and then indeed you will have a Paraphrase complete in all Points: *Who is he that overcomes the World, but he that believeth that the Gospel, is the Gospel*. And sure he must be a Dull thing indeed that cannot, and a Perverse one too, that will not believe, and Subscribe so Self-evident a Proposition. But the World is full of perverse People, and therefore no wonder if some will so understand it, And amongst many others, one *Volkeliuz*, lib. 3. de *verâ Relig*, p. 37. in John 1. 4. *In him was Life*, *Hoc est, Ipsi commissâ est vita Eterna & via ad eam ducentis Anunciatio, quâ Hominum animos mirificè collustravit, & Ignorantia tenebras (quantum in ipsa fuit) ab eis depulsi, quod idem alio in loco edisserit, 1 Joh. 5. 10. dum ait. Hoc est Testimonium, quod Deus Testatur est de filio suo, quod vitam Eternam nobis dedit Deus, & hæc in filio ejus est.* "That is, to him was committed the Declaration of Eternal Life, and of the Way that leads thither, whereby he wonderfully enlightened the Minds of Men, and scattered the Darkness of Ignorance from them (as much as in him lay) which he Discourses also in another place, 1 John 5. 10. &c. The Reader cannot but observe the Parenthesis, That *Christ enlightened men*, [as much as in him lay] if he could have done more, he would: But what would they expect from a Man? Now, when I observe our Author, in this very place, Deriding the Hopes of them, who expect to receive free Communications of Pardon and Grace, Righteousness and Salvation, from our Lord *Jesuu Christ*;

Metthink I see, [*Quantum in ipso fuit,*] and whether he filled his *Vessel* from that *Cistern* or no, is not so clear; but this is certain, that all came from the same *Fountain*. To conclude this Head, the Gloss of this Text according to the Proportion and Analogy of our Authors Faith, must be this: *He that believeth and obeyeth the Gospel, believeth and obeyeth Life; and he that believeth not, and obeyeth not the Gospel, believeth not, obeyeth not Life*: But our Gloss is this, He that hath an Interest in Christ, hath an Interest in Life, and he that hath not in the one, hath not in the other, but the Wrath of God abides on him; there being no means discovered whereby we can escape it, but by Jesus Christ.

It would have been small Satisfaction to our Author to pervert the *Sence*, unless he might be allowed also to pour Contempt upon the *Phrase of the Scripture*; which he has carried on to that height of Daring-provocation, that I am certain he never met with his *Superiour*, and do hope he may never find an *Equal*. He is at last grown almost weary of Reproaching the *Expressions of Men*, too mean a Quarry for one of his *Wing* to stoop at; and now the *Expressions of the Holy Ghost* must find him Game, that he may appear truly Great, by great *Enmities*. *Erostratus* was resolved to *Eternize his Name*, though by Firing the *Temple of Diana at Ephesus*: And *Nero* conceived great hopes from the *Burning of Rome*, and his *unsampled Butcheries*, to Inoculate his Name into History, that he might upon any Terms survive his Funeral. It's some *Alleviation* to them who Groan under the burden of *Obloquy*, that they meet with no harder Measure than

than their Lord and Master : And it might quiet the *grieved Spirit* of a *righteous Lot*, when his words are wrested ; when *the holy Spirit of God* is grieved with the Affronts put upon his *Expressions* : *The Disciple is not* (ought not expect to be) *above his Master*, nor *the Servant above his Lord* : It's enough that *the Disciple be as his Master*, and *the Servant as his Lord* : If they have called *the Master of the House Beelzebub*, how much more shall they call them of *the Household* ? Mat. 10. 24. Let them therefore possess their Souls in patience, and comfort one another with these words. And thus our Author enters upon his Business : It's Self-evident, that before we can be United to Christ, we must [go to Him] : And therefore Faith, which is the Instrument of this Union, is very Luckily called [coming to Christ,] from whence it is very evident, that to [believe in Christ] is to [go to Him] for Salvation : Which Metaphors [of coming, and going] are a very Intelligible Explication of Believing. But does this Gentleman think we have not sins enough of our own to answer for, but we must be Responsible for all the faults the Black-Jaundies of Malice can find in Scripture ? Or does he Fancy that we Penn'd the Scriptures, and therefore must lie at Stake for all the Incongruous expressions that he is able to suppose in them ? Well, thanks be unto God, that the Scriptures never yet found a Match able to Cope with them. For, 1. It's apparently false which he says, *These Metaphors* of coming, and going, are a very Intelligible explication of Believing : Whereas indeed, *Believing* is that which Explicates *those Metaphors* of [Coming, and Going.] With the same Fore-head he might have reviled Christ, for
Inter-

Interpreting the *Preaching of the Word*, by the *Sower sowing his Seed*; whereas the *Sower sowing his Seed*, is explicated by the *Preaching the Word*. 2. *Faith* (says he) is very *Luckily* called *coming to Christ*. I shall spare him that *Ignorant Expression*, that *Faith is called coming to Christ*: No Sir, not *Faith*, but *Believing*; not the *Peace*, but the *Attaining* of that *Grace* is so called. But I shall not wave his *blasphemous Flirtings of the holy Spirit*: What ever *Expressions* he has used to express *Faith*, or its *Acts* by, were upon *advice with his own wisdom*, who will not learn of him how to guide the *Heads*, and *Hearts*, and *Tongues*, and *Pens* of his *Amanuenses*, in revealing to us the *Mind and Will of God*. He has better *Authority* to *Justifie Quod scripsi, scripsi*, than either *Pilate* who once really *Crucified Christ*: Or that other who has often *Crucified him in Effigie*. It was *advisedly* so called, but *unluckily* reproached. 3. Those *Metaphors of coming, and going*, do very *aply*, and *Intelligibly* express the *Motion of the Saul in its turning from sin to God*, by *Faith in Jesus Christ*: For as in all *Local Motions*, there is a *Term from which*, and a *Term unto which* we move; so in this *Spiritual Motion*, there is a *State, or Term from which* we pass, that of *Sin and Enmity* against *God*; and another to which we pass, that of *Holiness and Peace* with *God*. Our *Saviour* thought meet, and we are to *Acquiesce* in his *Sovereign Wisdom*, sometimes to employ a *Metaphor in the Explicating of a Metaphor*, Mat. 13. 19. *Then comes the wicked one, and catcheth away the word that was sown in his heart*, ver. 21. *Yet hath he not Root in himself*, ver. 22. —The deceitfulness of *Riches* Choak the Word: and

and yet till of late he was never branded for *unintelligible explicating* of his Notions.

If now the Reader would have an Instance, to what Height *encouraged Prophaneness* may rise, let him read what follows. "But when the Soul is *'come to Christ, is this enough?* No sure: the Soul *'then must receive Christ,* as St. John tells us, *'1 Joh. 12. To as many as received him, so them he gave power to become the Sons of God:* That faith which serves us for Leggs to goe to Christ, must be a Hand to Receive him, and to apply all his Merits, and Fulness, and Righteousness to our Souls: And now when we have Received him, we must embrace him in our Arms too, as good old *Simeon* did, when he found him in the Temple, which is a little nearer *Union*, as plainly appears from the Example of the Patriarchs, who saw the Promises afar off, and embraced them, *Heb. 11. 13.* and now we have Christ, we must trust and lean upon Him, as we are often commanded to doe: which signifies that Act of Faith, whereby feeling our own weakness, as unable to support our selves, we do lean, and rest on Christ, and if leaning be not enough, we may make a little more bold, and Roll on him, as appears from *Psal. 37. 5.* Roll thy wayes on the Lord, as the Original [*Gat*] signifies; which is that Act of Faith, whereby we being weary, and heavy laden with sin, and seeking Ease, at last discharge our load, and cast it on Christ, and this is plain, from the phrase of *Believing in Christ, and on him;* for what can that signifie, but leaning and rolling on him, laying and building our selves on him as on a Foundation. And now we have thus brought our Souls to Christ, we

"we must commit them to his trust, to take charge
 "of them, and if they perish, it shall be his fault,
 "he must give an account of it: Thus St. *Paul* did,
 "*2 Tim.* 1. 12. I know whom I have believed, and I
 "am perswaded, that he is able to keep that I have
 "committed unto him against that day: and Now
 "we must hide our selves in Christ, from the fierce
 "wrath of God, as the Dove in the Rocks. But
 "this is not enough yet, for we must be cloathed
 "with the Righteousness of Christ. — And when
 "we are thus united to Christ, and made one with
 "him, then All Christ is ours, as the Apostle tells
 "us, All is yours, and ye are Christs, and Christ is
 "Gods. The Merit of his Death is ours, to free
 "us from the Guilt and Punishment of sin; and his
 "Active Obedience to the will of God, his Righte-
 "ousness is ours, for our Justification, as is plain in
 "that he is called, *The Lord our Righteousness*, and
 "as *J. O.* well observes, we are reconciled to God
 "by the Death of his Son, and saved by his Life,
 "*Rom.* 5. 10.

And now I hope there's none needs question but
 our Author is laid in with a *Competency* of those
 Endowments, that may enable him to Deride the
 whole Bible, from the first of *Genesis* to the last
 of the *Revelations*: If our Author does not judge
with others about the *Meaning of these phrases* and
 Expressions of Scripture, he had the liberty (for
 ought I know) to discover, and (if he must needs) to
 expose their *Mistakes*; but to droll upon the *very*
Expressions of Scripture, without reference to any
 Interpretation, and (if to any) to that which is most
 evidently the True, is a *Degree* above the *superla-*
tive of Blasphemy. Let others admire which of his
 Talents

Talents they see good; for my own part, I read more of Ignorance in it, than of all his other Characters. 1. One groſs piece of Ignorance is, that he makes the Patriarchs embracing of the Promiſes, explain Simeon's embracing Chriſt in the Temple. 2. That in his goodly ſuppoſed Method of the Souls coming to Chriſt; he fancies, firſt that we have Chriſt, and truſt and lean upon him, and yet after a while (as if it were a new degree of Faith) he tells us, *we muſt commit our Souls to him.* 3. He fancies, that to come to Chriſt, to receive him, to embrace him, are ſeveral Acts of Faith, diſtinguiſhed by ſome Intervals of time: But let us hear the guilts of theſe Scriptures, and his little Gloſſes: Why they offend againſt his great ſtanding Rule, *Interpreting things by the ſound of words.* For (ſays he) *what better proof can you deſire for all this, than Expreſs words?* Really, the Laws upon which we muſt be permitted to diſcourſe with our Author, are very ſevere; for, p. 78. he laid it down as a Law of the Medes and Perſians, that none muſt dare to Draw one Conclusion from the Perſon of Chriſt, which his Goſpel hath not expreſſely taught: Well, we accepted the Terms, and have brought him expreſſe, and expreſſely expreſs words, and do ſpeak as Volkelius commands us, *dilectis luculentiffimiſq; verbis,* and yet we are never the nearer; for now we offend in truſting to the ſound of words. Juſt thus did Procruſtes entertain his Gueſts, wracking out them that were too ſhort, and lopping off their feet that were too long for his Bed: All men I perceive are awake to their Concerns in this Rule, as well as our Vigilant Author: When it is urged, that Chriſt is called expreſſely God, the True God, He that was
in

in the beginning, by whom were all things made; who upholds all things by the Word of his Power; the Socinians have now a compendious Answer. Ay, this is to interpret Scripture by the sound of words: And the Atheist has an inkling of it too; he can subscribe all the Scriptures as True, but when you urge him that God created all things out of Nothing; that he is the Owner, Governour, Judge of the whole World; they are provided with a short Answer: Yes, this is interpreting Scripture by the sound of words: And whether every Drunkard, Swearer, Adulterer, all the Rakebells and Rakeshames upon Earth, may not in time make their advantage of it, I cannot tell; That Ministers do but fright them with a sound of words: Thus have some dealt with the *Sacerdotal Office of Christ*; He is a Priest (they confess,) he offer'd a Sacrifice, was a Propitiation, made an Atonement, did expiate sin; but have a care you do not interpret these things as the words sound: he did indeed something like a Priest, offer'd something like a Sacrifice, but truly and properly he was nothing, did nothing of All this. It had been therefore more plain-heartedly and ingenuously done, had our Author written a Confutation of the Scripture, proving that the Spirit did not speak intelligibly; but All in good time, he has Materials ready for the work. P. 100. The wildest, and most extravagant Opinions that were ever yet vented under the Name of Religion, have pretended the Authority of Scripture for their Patronage: And yet he knew, how first to break its head, and then make it a Playster.

This famous Rule of our Authors, may be applied to all things under the Sun; but there are

two

two Principles onely that he will examine by it at present.

(1.) *The spiritual Impotency of all men without grace to perform that which is Acceptable to God: This (says he) they prove wonderfully from our being dead in trespasses and sins; and therefore, as a Dead man can contribute nothing to his own Resurrection, no more can we towards our Conversion. I wonder when the Scripture will be able to speak so plain, that deaf men will understand it? One would have thought, the Spirit of God should never have chosen that Expression of being Dead in trespasses and sins, to signifie, what mighty power and abilities the Creature has to Obey: But we are instructed better from this usefull Caveat; not to interpret Him, by the sound of his words; for now we must understand by [Being dead] [Being Alive,] and proportionably by [Sins and Trespasses,] we must understand [Duty, and Obedience,] and then to keep close to our Instructions, and far enough from the sound of words, To be Dead in Sins and Trespasses, is to be Alive to all Duty and Obedience. And thus that other vexing place, Rom. 5. When we were without strength, in due time, Christ dyed for the ungodly; must be Paraphrased, When we were strong and Active, and had no need of Christ, he dyed for the godly. And this I think (if that be good for ought,) is very remote from grating our Ears with the unpleasant sound of words. Ay, but (says our Author) This is true of Natural Death, but will be hard to prove of a Moral Death. Hard to prove! Methinks we want his wonted out-facing Confidence: But why so hard to prove? Has not the Spirit of God selected those words borrowed from the Con-*
dition

dition of one *Naturally dead*, to instruct us in the true Condition of one *Morally dead*? It's true of a *Natural*, and therefore not of a *Moral Death*. Nay, it's therefore true of a *Moral Death*, because it is so of a *Natural Death*. What wild Similitudes would he impose upon the Holy Scriptures? Even as one that's *Naturally dead* can contribute Nothing to his *Resurrection*, just so, one that's *Morally dead* can contribute something to his *Conversion*. This is the great *Illustrator* of dark *Metaphors*. But wherein doth this *Morall Death* consist? Oh (says he) In the prevalency of vicious habits contracted by long Custom, (which was the Case of the *Heathens* whom the *Apostle* there speaks of) which do so enslave the Will, that it's very difficult, though not impossible, for such Persons to return to the love and practice of *Vertue*. But who can tell, whether by [enslaving the Will] which is a *Luscious Metaphor*, our Author would not have us understand, [enfranchising the Will,] lest we should border too near upon a sound of words? But I am not illuminated with our Authors Reasonings: For, (1) *Moral Death* doth not consist in the prevalency of vicious Habits, it is the general Condition of all men born into the world; who are *privatively Dead* in respect of that Life we all once had in the first *Adam*; and *Negatively Dead*, in respect of that Life which is attainable by the second *Adam*. And in those dayes, when men studied not *Æquivocations* to subscribe every thing, and believe Nothing, it was not question'd in the Church of England: Art. 10. The Condition of Man since the Fall is such, that he cannot Turn and prepare himself, by his Own Natural Strength, and good Works, to Faith, and calling upon God; wherefore

fore we have no power to doe good works, pleasant and acceptable to God, without his Grace preventing us, that we may have a good Will, and working with us when we have that Will. But, (2) Supposing that this Moral Death did consist in the Prevalency of vicious Habits, contracted by long Custom, yet such may be the prevalency of them, into such a slavery may the Will be brought, that it may be not only difficult but impossible (without the effectual assistance of the Spirit,) for the Sinner to return to God. Jer. 13. 23. Can the Ethiopian change his skin, or the Leopard his spots: then may ye also doe good, that are accustomed to doe evil: Whence the Prophet shews, that such is the prevalency of a vicious Habit, contracted by long Custom, that it's as possible for the Black-Moore to wash himself white, (which is the Embleme of Labour in Vain) or the Leopard to rub out his Dapples, as for such a one, so enslaved, to doe good. And if difficulty onely be designed in the Comparison, there's great danger of seduction, to have the Case of habituated sinners thus described. (3) Our Author is much mistaken, to say, That the Apostle speaks of the Case of the Heathens: The place is, Eph. 2. 1. And you hath he quickened, who were Dead, in Trespasses, and Sins, &c. And these things are, exceeding clear:

1. That to be dead in Trespasses and Sins, (let it signifie what it will) is a Condition common to Jew and Gentile. v. 3. Amongst whom also we all had our Conversation in times past, in the lusts of the flesh, fulfilling the desires of the Mind, and of the Flesh, and were by Nature the Children of wrath, even as others. v. 5. When we were dead in sins.
2. That the same Power and Grace was required

Y

to

to Quickening of the one, as the other. v. 4. God who is rich in Mercy, for his great Love where- with he loved us, quickned us, &c. (4) It's very ridiculous to express some strength by None: As if you should say, A dead man will hardly walk above five miles a day, and then he must rest him- self too at every miles end. It's true, a Natural Death does not deny a Resurrection by Divine Power, nor a Moral Death exclude the efficacious Power of him that raised up Jesus from the dead, yet both exclude all Ability in the subject, or we must despair of ever understanding one Syllable of Scrip- ture to the Worlds end.

(2.) There is Another Doctrine he will examine by this Rule, viz. the Manner of Gods Working in Regeneration. Concerning which, the Apostle Eph. 2. 10. (when he had before shewed all to be dead in Trespasses and Sins,) thus expresses himself: For we are his workmanship created in Christ Jesus unto good works; and 2 Cor. 5. 17. He that is in Christ is [a New Creature.] Wherein the Apostle does instruct us in three very material points. 1. Here is the Product of Gods Grace. A real Effect, *ἔργον*. Something brought forth; *καὶ ἄλλως*. a New Creature, a New Creation; Another, a better, though a lesser World. 2. The End of this Work, or Product of Gods powerfull Grace; *ἵνα ἕως ἀγαθῶν*. it was to good works, which God ordained they should walk in. The End of the New Heart, New Creature, and New Nature, is New Obedience. 3. The Manner of Gods producing this work; *ἡμεῖς*. ye were Created to that End; so that as God at the first by his Creating Power exerted, brought forth the Creature, and gave it power to bring forth fruit after

after its Kind: So in this *New Creation*, there is something that *Answers* both the *created Effect*, the *Creating Power*, and the *End of this Creation*. This would have done pretty well, had it not chimed too near the words; and therefore our Author shall expound it himself; and then (if ever) he will be in the good Humour. This were true (says he) if our being created to good works did signify the *Manner* and *Method* of our *Conversion*, and not the *Nature* of the *New Creature*. But what if it signifies both? Here's a *Workmanship*; and here's the *Manner* of working: We are his *Workmanship* created. The work, called a *New Creature*, shews the *Thing*; and its being said to be done by *Creation*, shews the *Manner*. All the Apostles Metaphor will else be very lame; The *Manner* of Gods producing the *Old Creation* expressed, but *Nothing* to answer it in the *New Creation*; and yet this was the *Main* of his design: v. 5. *Even when we were dead in sins and trespasses, he hath quickened us*; v. 8. *By Grace ye are saved, not of your selves, it's the Gift of God*. But let us hear his Paraphrase: *That as in the first Creation we were created after the Image of God; so we are renewed after his Image in the second, which is therefore expressly called Renewing, and Renovation: An excellent Similitude; just as God wrought All in the first Creation, so (for all the world) he does Nothing in the second: That is, in plain Terms, The New Creation is no Creation; and the Apostle could not more unluckily have express'd the Doctrine of our own Ability to good Works, than by saying, we were created by God in Christ Jesus, to the Performance of them: To conclude, That the Image of God restored, should an-*

swer the Image in which God created Man at first, I can be content; onely, to fill up the Parallel, What is that all of God in the New, which answers to Gods creating All in the first Creation? And that the New Creation should be called a Renovation, I can very well digest; but then we must take in Gods Renewing Power, as well as the Renewed Effect; but that this is called so, expressly in other places, I do not very well approve, (nor will our Author, when he thinks better upon't,) for that will discredit the whole Paraphrase, because it chimes too harmoniously to the sound of words.

Hitherto we have heard a very learned Declamation against interpreting Scripture by the sound of words; and now we shall have another Oration against Metaphors, Similitudes, Allegories, Types, Figures, and all this under the same Head. If they say, Christ is our Righteousness, our Wisdom, &c. then they interpret all by the sound of words; and if they say, the Pearl, the Manna, the Rock, &c. signified Christ, which seems to be very remote from, yet that is interpreting Scripture by the sound of words also; so that we are in a Fork, Snick or Snee; and both wayes equally undone: Mr. Watson thinks that The Pearl in the Parable, *Math. 13. 46.* may be accommodated to Christ; for, as the Pearl is there said to be πολύτιμος so Christ is called λίθος ἁγιωσύνης & πύλη 1 Pet. 2. 7. That he was prefigured by the Manna, upon the onely Credit of Christs own Interpretation: *Joh. 6. 48. I am the Bread of Life; your Fathers did eat Manna in the Wilderness, and are dead: This is the bread that cometh down from Heaven, that a man may eat thereof, and not dye.* That the Rock also did typifie Christ; from the Apostles

Apostles warrant, 1 Cor. 10. 3. *They drank of the Rock that followed them, and that Rock was Christ:* That Christ was also Resembled by the Brazen Serpent, upon Christs own Authority, Job. 3. 14, 15. *As Moses lifted up the Serpent in the Wilderness, even so must the Son of Man be lifted up:* and that Christ is compared to a Vine, Joh. 15. 1. *I am the True Vine:* He proves also, (or thinks he proves) That Christ has very lovely and excellent Titles given him in the Scriptures. *He is the Desire of all Nations*, Hag. 2. 7. *The Prince of Peace*, Isa. 9. 6. *The Holy One of Israel*, Isa. 41. 14. *Elect and precious*, 1 Pet. 2. 6. That he was also typified by most excellent and glorious Persons and Things: By *Moses, David, Solomon*; by the *Pillar of Cloud*, by the *Rose of Sharon*. In the pursuit of which Metaphors and Types, perhaps he has a little *overshot* himself; and alas, how easie a matter is that? It's very hard to *stop at a point*, when we are upon the full speed. St. George himself *straining for a blow* at the Dragon, had like to have come over: These are *Human Errors*, and I wish our Authors were of no worse Consequence. But, 1. Our Author forgets himself to say, that Mr. W. uses these Metaphors to prove, when all the Service they doe him, is to *illustrate* his Doctrine, sufficiently *otherwise confirmed* from innumerable Scriptures: If our Author will not allow the *Pearl* to signifie Christs *Preciousness*, yet it's very clear that Christ is *precious*. If he boggle, that the *circular Figure of Manna* should denote Christs *Perfection*, yet that he is *Perfect*, is undeniable. 2. Whatever was a *Type* of Christ, represented *some of his Personal Excellencies, Actions, or Sufferings*, &c. If then we single out the

most eminent of their Natural Excellencies, and then consider which of Christs spiritual Excellencies syncretize with them; all the hurt that s in it is, that those Types are more beholden to Christ, than he to them. And, 3. We ought to consider, that there's a greater latitude of Expression allowed in Open banded Discourses ad Populum, than in your Double-fisted Disputations in the Schools: Our blessed Saviour does accommodate his Discourses to his Disciples, and preach as they were able to hear him; and Mr. Watson does not alwayes preach or write, to such long-ear'd People as our Author is. And thus after all, Mr. Watson may be very Innocent; but whosoever is in the *the Right*, our Author will be sure to be in *the Wrong*; for when all that Discourse had spent it self to perswade us, that Christ is excellent, that he deserves our Love, our Service and Obedience; our Author could make no better use on't, than to throw a Flout upon the very Person of our Redeemer: *Who (says he) can forbear being smitten with so lovely a Person?* Really he may do well to consider, whether his *License* will justify him to Scoffe at Christs Person, *tories quotes* he meets with any that shall dare to give him a good word: I have known some so prodigal of their Friends, that they would sell the best they had for a sorry frothy Jest: but should our Author forfeit the Favour of Christ, when he shall most need it, for a poor half-witted Conceit, it would be more than he would ever get by it. But hence we learn, how difficult it is, for any to have a little more Wis than his Neighbours, and not to discover it; though it had been more comely to have been facetious any where, than against A Saviour; and may he in time come

come to himself, least he be *smitten with Christ* in a fence not to his goodliking.

[2] The Second Way whereby *these men* Pervert the Scripture is, that they argue from their own *preconceived Notions and Opinions, about the sense of Scripture*. And (to have sav'd charges) both *these* might have been mustered for one, but then it would not have born *such a Port*, nor carryed so much state and Majesty in its looks: The first way was, *When they find any words in Scripture which chime to the Tune of their private Conceits, they interpret them by the sound of words*: And this second way is the first way, in other words; *when they Argue from their own pre-conceived Notions*: But perhaps there may be some subtle *Essential difference*, between [their own Conceits,] and their [own preconceived Notions,] which though *he can*, every one cannot discover: Now of this first, or second, or same, or New, or no Way, (call it which he pleases) he will give us some few Instances.

(1.) There are (says he) a great many places, which expressly tell us, we are justified by Faith, have Remission of sins by Faith, &c. Now the difficulty will be, how we shall Reconcile these Scriptures to their Notion of being justified by Christ's Righteousness. For (as he acutely observes) Faith certainly is not the Righteousness of Christ in their Notion of it: (No nor in his neither, if he rightly understands himself.) Now those other men have a way to Reconcile our being Justified by the Righteousness of Christ onely, and our being justified by Faith onely; and it is this: When Faith is said to justify, they understand not this Absolutely, as if Faith did justify, either as it is a Work wrought

in us, or an Act performed by us; but relatively, as it makes us one with Christ, by whom we are justified: And they assign this Reason for it: Because, had Justification been promised to anything wrought in us, or done by us, it had been by Works: And this Conciliation of the true Interest of Faith, and Christ, in the business of Justification, is justified by the Doctrine of the Church of England: Art. 11. *We are accounted Righteous before God, onely for the Merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, by Faith, and not for our own Works or Deservings; wherefore, that we are justified by Faith onely, is a most wholsom Doctrine.* Now our Author might with great Applause have placed out his *Reconciling skill* upon this Article: How we can be Justified [for the Merit of Christ onely,] and yet [by Faith onely]? And again: How we can be Justified [by Faith onely,] or indeed at all, and yet [not for our own Works?] we find in Scripture, that the same Effects are attributed to Faith, which are attributed to Christ: *Justified by Christ*, Isa. 53. 11. and *justified by Faith*, Rom. 3. 28. *We live by Christ*, Joh. 6. 57. and *we live by Faith*, Gal. 2. 20. *Are pardon'd by Christ*, Act. 13. 38. *are pardon'd also by Faith*, Act. 26. 18. *Have peace with God by Christ*, Col. 1. 20. *have peace with him also by Faith*, Rom. 5. 2. *Have Access to God by Christ*, Eph. 2. 18. *have Access also by Faith*, Eph. 3. 12. *Are sanctified by Christ*, Heb. 10. 14. and *sanctified by Faith*, Act. 15. 9. *Overcome the World by Christ*, Joh. 16. 33. and so also by Faith, 1 Joh. 5. 4, 5. *The Sons of God by Christ*, Eph. 1. 5. and so by Faith, Gal. 3. 26.

These things being thus, it seems to be a worthy Enquiry,

Enquiry, what *Part and Share* Christ may *Challenge*, and what *Faith* may *claim* in the *Justification* of a Soul before God; that so we may *give unto Christ the things that are Christs*, and *unto Faith the things that are Faiths*. And, 1. It's very evident, that their Concerns are really *Distinct*; Christ *Justifies in one respect*, Faith *in another*: It's possible that some (*ver. 9. Infants*) may be *Justified without Faith* in Christ, but impossible that any should be *Justified without Gods respect to Christ*; for herein the Scripture is *Peremptory*, and God is at a point with all the World, *Acts 4. 12. There's no other Name under Heaven given by which we must be saved, neither is there Salvation in any other.* 2. It's evident from those very Places where the Concerns of Christ, and of Faith, are *joynly mentioned*, not only that they have really *distinct Interests*, but that Christ carries the *Supremacy*, and that Faith has only a *subservient Concernment* therein, *Rom. 5. 1. Therefore being justified by Faith, we have peace with God, through our Lord Jesus Christ.* Whence it's plain, that whatever Faith contributes to our peace with God, yet even that Operates through Jesus Christ, *διὰ τοῦ xpoῦ ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ xpoῦ*. So *Gal. 3. 16. Ye are all the Children of God, by Faith in Jesus Christ*: It's the Redeemer as made a *Curse for us*, *ver. 13.* that gives Faith all it's *Virtue and Efficacy*. And, *Gal. 2. 20. The life which I now live in the Flesh, I live by the Faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave Himself for me*: Where such a Concernment is ascribed to Christ, in the Souls life, that Faith is not at all *Capable of*; *He loved me, and gave himself for me.* 3. It's no less evident, that Christ by his *Death* and

and Sufferings, has removed those insuperable Impediments, which lay in the way of a sinners Justification, Reconciliation with God, Expiation of sin, which Faith could not possibly Undertake, and Achieve. 4. That what ever Parts Christ and Faith have in this Glorious work, yet no more must be Ascribed to either, than can consist with a Free, and Gratuious Justification, Rom. 3. 24. *Being justified freely by his Grace, δωρεάν, τῷ ἀγαθῷ χάριτι.* And, 5. It's evident that the Sacrifice, Sufferings, &c. of Christ, and that Reconciliation and Atonement procured by them, do not in the least Enterfere with Justification by Free-Grace; for Christ himself is Free-gift, and that God would admit a Mediator, to Interpose on our behalf, that he would accept a Propitiation for us, is all due to Free-Grace; and therefore Free-Grace and Jesus Christ are joyned together, Rom. 3. 24. *Being justified freely by his Grace, through the Redemption that is in Jesus Christ.* 6. It is also as evident, that to ascribe Justification to Faith as it is our Work, or Act, will take off just so much from the freedom of Grace, as is ascribed to it, as a work in us, or done by us; and therefore Faith must needs Justifie us by vertue of that respect that it carries towards a Redeemer; and to assign it any other Interest, is to Entrench upon that free Justification, which the Gospel does so abundantly Preach: Now what Title to give to Faith as it Justifies, whether that of an Instrument, or a Condition, I dispute not; let the proper Concerns of Faith and Christ be secured, and their distinct Actings kept Inviolable, and Sacred, and if any can find more apposite, and significant Terms, than Protestants have used, I shall be very well

well content: But now our Author will favour us with a Reason, why *Justification by Faith* as it is our own *Act*, may consist with *Justification by Free-Grace*. Modest men (says he) who dream not of *Meriting by every thing they do*, would have thought, that *Free-Grace and Faith*, might have been easily reconciled, though *Faith* had justified as our own *Act*, since the *Reward and Recompence*, does so infinitely exceed the *Work*, that there can be no suspicion of *Merit*; and where there is no *Merit*, the reward is of *Grace*, and not of *Debt*, what ever the Condition of the *Promise* be. But, 1. Gods *Free-Grace* will not be beholden to, nor stand to the *Courtesie* of Mans *Modesty*; and besides, all men are not so *Modest* as our Author is; and if they were, it would be hard *Trusting* them: Man is indeed, a very *Proud and Haughty Creature*, till *Free Grace* tames him, loth to stoop to those *Methods of Gods Wisdom* for the abasing the *Creature*, that *Grace* may be magnified in his *Mercies*. And I see plainly, that God has *Contrived* the way of shewing favour to a lost *Sinner*, in such *Wisdom* that every *Mouth* shall be stopped, that *Boasting* shall be excluded, and that no *Flesh* shall glory in his presence, 1 Cor. 1. 29.

2. It's not what men will do out of their *sweet Natures*, that comes here into *Consideration*; but what they may do, God has taken a *Course* they shall not, cannot have cause to *Glory*; but if the sinner be justified by his own *Act*, as 'tis his, he has whereof to boast, Rom. 4. 2. If *Abraham* were justified by *Works*, he hath whereof to boast; though it may be some *Virtuoso's* would be so *Modest and Civil*, as not to lay it in the *Dish* of *Free-Grace*. 3. It's precariously supposed, that *Grace*

in

in the justification of a sinner, is only opposed to Merit : The Scripture has opposed it to Works, and set them as Inconsistent in the dealings out of Mercy from God to men, whether there be such a proportion between the Work and the Reward, or no, Rom. 11. 6. And if by Grace, then it's no more of Works, otherwise Grace is no more Grace. 4. They may be very Immodest men, and yet want the Confidence to dream of Merit by every thing they do; and yet there are those that dream to this day of Meriting Heaven by that, for which they a thousand times better merit a Halter.

Protestant Divines in the explicating the Concerns of Faith in our Justification, that they might Accommodate their Discourses to the Capacity of them with whom they deal, have found out certain *Similitudes*, which do well express their own Intentions, when they say : *Faith justifies us not as our own Act, but by virtue of its Relation to Christ, who is our Righteousness.* Thus we say, *the Ring stanches Blood*, and yet we intend no more than that the *Hematites* set in it, has that *Vertue* : That *our Hand* relieves us, and yet perhaps it contributes no more towards it, than that it *receives the Charity of another* : That a *Bucket* quenches our Thirst, yet all it does, is to *bring us the Water* from the Fountain, which quenches it. And many others they have Invented, *the best they could find*, none so mean but is above *Contempt*, yet none so excellent to be above *Malice*. The use they make of them is (as I said) to *cloath their Conceptions*, and give some *Light* into the Thing, but by no means to *prove the Truth*, when it is drawn into Controversie. But from hence, our Author is taking another

Ram-

Ramble, and going to run his old Wild-Goose Chase of Prophaneness, and Scurrility; the easiest way of Confutation certainly, that ever was Invented: But let his own Folly chastise him, or if not, delight him; and in the mean time excuse me from bearing him Company.

(2.) Another Instance, and *but another*, he will give us: How *Men argue from their preconceived Notions*, and that is about the *Necessity of Good Works*. For (says he) *when they are pressed with those Scriptures that urge the Necessity of Good Works*.—What do they then? Nay, that he could not tell, but carries on a *suspended Sence*, for almost two whole *Pages*, and in the end leaves it *unintelligible Nonsense*. But however, let us hear those Texts that are *so pressing for Good works, and a holy Life*. Why? *Without Holiness, no Man shall see God: The wrath of God is revealed from Heaven against all Unrighteousness and Ungodliness of Men*. Truly, these Scriptures do *press upon our Consciences, and Practices*, but not upon our *Principles*: Well, then there are others that assert, *Our Acceptation with God, depends upon a Holy and Vertuous life*. I promise you that presses indeed! But it does not press me: *Our Acceptation with God, depends upon a Holy life, as the Qualification, but it depends upon Christ for Procurement*: But the places are, *Acts 10. 35. God is no Respector of Persons, but in every Nation he that feareth God, and worketh Righteousness, is accepted of him*. Well, let us examine whom this Text does press most? The Apostle *Peter* in that excellent Discourse, *ver. 43.* tells us: *To him [Christ] give all the Prophets witness, that through his Name,*
who-

whoſoever believeth in Him, ſhould receive Remiſſion of ſins. Whatſoever of acceptation with God then, they that fear God, and work Righteouſneſs do obtain, ſtill it's through the Name of Chriſt. The Text then preſſes not us, he muſt call for more weight, if he deſigns to Preſs us to Death: But as I remember, pag. 44. our Author with much Confidence would bear us down, that the Jews who knew nothing at all of Chriſt, yet underſtood God to be a Sin-pardoning God. And yet the Apoſtle aſſures us, 1. That all the Prophets gave witneſs to Chriſt. 2. That their Teſtimony was this, That they were to expect Remiſſion of ſins, through the Name of Chriſt. 3. That the Means of acquiring the Remiſſion of ſins through Chriſt, was by believing in Him. And now let him ask his own Shoulders, whether this Text does not preſs him; But there is another Scripture that will break their bones, *Mat. 5. 20. Except your righteouſneſs exceed the righteouſneſs of the Scribes and Pharifees, ye ſhall in no caſe enter into the Kingdom of Heaven.* And what was their Righteouſneſs? Why he tells us: They were a company of Immoral Hypocrites, who placed all their Righteouſneſs in obſerving the Ceremonies of the Law, without the purity of their Hearts and Lives. Well, and we think a Man may Travel a great many Leagues beyond ſuch Debauches, and never come near the Kingdom of Heaven. Let them then Groan under the weight of it, who place their Religion in Ceremony, and prophane Drollery; it preſſes not them, who profeſſing Faith in our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, and Repentance from Dead works, ſubject themſelves to his Goſpel. Well, but there is one more that will Grind them to Powder, ver. 19.

He

He
and
dom
who
to C
pen
amo
then
dom
T
toun
doub
this
and
will
is of
verſe
nece
ment
This
It's
not e
Sons
purpo
That
it's n
Holy
neith
the L
Us,
thor
comm
the L
their

He that breaks the least of these Commandments, and teaches men so, shall be called least in the Kingdom of Heaven. And this will certainly press them, who Renouncing their part in the Satisfaction given to God by Christ, truit to their own Imperfekt repentance, wherein there are so many Flaws, as will amount to the breach of some Commandment, and then our Author has quite shut them out of the Kingdom of Heaven.

To conclude this Section, our Author has one round Fling at Doctor Owen, and it is *ex Officio*, no doubt: I suppose he may hold some fair Estate by this Tenure, That he Persecute the Doctor with Fire and Faggot, as far as a pair of Shoes of a great price will carry him. The Question is, What necessity there is of Obedience? The Doctor had said, That Universal Obedience and good Works, are Indispensibly necessary to Salvation; by the sovereign appointments and Will of God. To this our Author answers: This is not one syllable to the purpose! Why then, It's the end of the Fathers electing Love. That's not one syllable to the purpose! It's the end of the Sons redeeming Love. That's not one syllable to the purpose! It's the end of the Spirits sanctifying Love. That's not one syllable to the purpose! Well, but it's necessary to the Glory of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. That's not one syllable to the purpose neither. If neither the Sovereignty of God over us, the Love of God to us, nor the Glorifying of God by Us, be to the purpose of Obedience; let our Author speak to the purpose. So he will: God hath commanded Obedience, but where's the Sanction of the Law? Will he Damn all that will not Obey for their Disobedience? Where's the Sanction of the Law?

Law? I am sure that Question is very little to the purpose. It's the Command it self that makes a Duty, that creates a necessity: The Authority of the Law-giver, lays the Obligation upon the Subject. It's our Interest to Obey, upon the account of the Sanction; but it's our duty to Obey upon the Command it self: But not to hold him in suspense, God will Damn all those that will not Obey, for their Disobedience.

Our Author has now quite run himself a Ground, and is Pumpt dry of his Drollery, and therefore turns Catechist, and Persecutes us with Impertinent Queries. I have heard some say, that an Ideot may tie more Knots in an Hour, than a Wise-man can untie in a day. But however, though we might plead it's *Coram non Judice*, yet for once, let him suppose himself in his Desk, and his poor Catechumens humbly waiting upon his Foot-stool.

Quest. Will God Damn those who do not Obey for their disobedience? Answ. Yes, and it please you Sir.

Qu. But will he save, and reward those who do Obey for their Obedience? An. He will reward their Obedience, but not save them for their Obedience.

Qu. But will the Father Elect none but those that are Holy? An. Yes, and it like your good Learning, he Elects them that they may be Holy, but not because they are Holy, Ephes. 1. 4. Ephes. 2. 10.

Qu. But wil the Son Redeem none but those that are holy? An. Yes, indced Sir, a great many; for a Redeemer supposes them to be sinners, and Captives under sin.

Qu. But will he reject and Reprobate all that are not Holy? An. God has not Reprobated all that were, or are not holy; for then he had Reprobated all the World, but he will reject

all

all that continue unholy to the Death. Qu. But tell me, Doth this Election, and Redemption, suppose Holiness in us, or is it without any regard to it?

An. Neither the one nor the other: It's *Fallacia plurium Interrogationum*: They neither presuppose Holiness in us, nor are they without all regard to Holiness; it is a necessary Effect but not a Cause of Election and Redemption. Qu. Dost thou stand chopping Logick with thy Betters? If we be Elect-ed and Redeemed without regard to our being Holy, our Election and Redemption is secure, whether we be Holy or no. An. Good Sir excuse me, we are Elect-ed to Grace, as well as to Glory, and he that appoints to the end, appoints to the necessary means leading to the end. Qu. But is holyness necessary on our parts? An. Yes, indeed Sir, that we be so, but it's necessary also that Grace make us so, unless we can make our selves so. Qu. "But

"how can Obedience be for the Glory of the Father, Son, and Spirit, when the necessity of Holiness is so destructive to free Grace? An. Obedience in its proper place, and for its proper end, is not destructive to free Grace: But when Hypocrites will assign it a room which God has not appointed, as to justify us before a righteous Judge, and give us a proper right to Heaven, then it crosses the design of free Grace. Qu. "But how can Holiness be "for our honour, in making us like God, when the "perfect Righteousness of Christ would be more "for our honour? An. Good, Sir, be not angry, and I'll tell you: Inherent Righteousness is much for our honour, being compleat in its kind; but Imputed righteousness is more for our honour, being absolutely compleat. Qu. But you say, Holiness

is for our Peace; Must we then at last fetch our peace from our Duties and Graces, is not this to renounce Christ? *An.* Pray, Sir, be not so hasty, we have our Reconciliation with God, and Security from his Wrath, by the Blood of Christ; but we have our inward peace in the Conscience, from the evidence of our Sanctification. *Qu.* But does not

Doctor O. say, That we must not set about correcting our Lives; for by the deeds of the Law, no man is Justified, and that if God should mark what is done amiss, there's no standing before him?

An. Yes indeed does he, That we must not set about correcting our Lives, in order to Justification before the Righteous Judge of all the Earth. *Qu.*

But how can Holiness serve for the Conviction of Enemies, when it is not Essentially necessary to his Friends? *An.* Indeed, Sir, if you will believe me, it's Essentially necessary to all his Friends;

and I pray it may prove more serviceable to the Conviction of his Enemies. *Qu.* Wilt thou dare to Contradict me? I tell thee, I am resolved, they shall hold, that Holiness is not necessary to Salvation.

An. Nay, pray Sir, do not force them to that: And if you can make any shift, Rail at them upon some other account. *Qu.* "But how can

"Holiness be necessary to the Conversion of others, "when men may be Converted without it? *An.* Ay, indeed, if your Worship can Inform us how to conceive of Conversion without Holiness, you shall be owned for the Wisest man in all the Parish.

Qu. "But why cannot the Righteousness of Christ "keep the Judgments of God from others, more "effectually than the Holiness of men? *An.* Be-

cause visible Holiness honours God most before men and

and therefore he will honour it most with *visible Mercies*. Qu. But how can Obedience be necessary to the state of justified Persons, when they are clothed with the Robes of Christs righteousness, which is the only Foundation of our Communion with God? An. Very well, Sir, for though Christs righteousness be the Foundation of our Communion, yet Holiness and Obedience, give us a meetness and fitness for the exercise of that Communion. Qu. But how can Holiness be necessary to Sanctification? An. Holy Obedience is necessary to Sanctification, because the new Creature is Nourisht by suitable Acts of Obedience; even as all other things are fed by those things of which they are made. Qu. But is not this *Idem per Idem*? An. No, I assure you Sir, for the *Vital Principle* of Obedience, and the *Living Fruits* of it are really *two distinct* things. Qu. But yet I cannot see any necessary Obligation to Holiness, from those mens Principles, what should be the Reason? An. I can soon tell you that, Sir, do you not remember, you almost Pored out your Eyes, in the second Section. Qu. I have one question more, answer me that, and take all: *Is Holiness necessary to Salvation, as a means to an End?* Now speak to the purpose. An. Really, Sir, it is *absolutely and indispensibly necessary*. Qu. This is indeed, Home, Pertinent, and somewhat to the purpose; but yet I have a question or two more, I am sure will Choak you: Come on your ways, young Man: What say you? What, *Holiness necessary to Eternal Life, and yet neither the Cause, Matter, nor Condition?* An. Sir, I perceive you have a frail Memory, for you quoted the Doctor just before, saying, *It was neither Matter, Cause, nor Condition,*

tion of our Justification: And now you put the question about its being the Cause, Matter, or Condition, of Eternal Salvation. Qu. Did you spie that? An. Do you think your Readers have all pored their Eyes out, as well as your self? Quest. Well, hold your peace, I will now Irrefragably prove, Holiness to be a Cause, at least *Causa sine qua non*, of Eternal Life: What say you to that? An. Pray spare your pains, lest you spoil the Cause; for if you can prove it no better a Cause, you had as good let it alone, for *Causa sine qua non, non est Causa*; we allow it to be both the Condition and the Matter also of Eternal Life: It's the Condition, for the Doctor has owned expressly, *That none shall come to the end, who walks not in the way*: And it's the Matter too, for *Grace is Glory begun, and Happiness is Holiness perfected*. Qu. Well, I will not Dispute about words, I am content it should only be a necessary way to Eternal Life: But what becomes of Christ then, who is the only way? An. Take you no care for that, Christ is the only way of Merit, Purchase, and Procurement; but Holiness is a way of Means, preparatory Meekness, and Fitness for Eternal Life. I suppose you sometimes read the 11th. Art. of the Church of England, which acquaints you, that we are Justified only for Christ's Merits, and yet justified by Faith only. There may be several Only's in the same Effect, and yet each the Only one, in suo genere. Qu. But is not the Righteousness of Christ able to save us, without an additional righteousness of our own? An. No, Sir, for the Righteousness of Christ being made ours, by the appointment, constitution, and free Gift of God, we must enjoy the benefits of

of it, in that *Method* it pleases the Donour to Or-
 dain. It's reason the Giver should dispose of his own
 Gift: And yet it's true, the Righteousness of Christ is
 able to save us without any of our own, employed
 for that special end for which the righteousness of
 Christ is used. Qu. "But do the Active and Pas-
 sive Righteousness of Christ both free us from
 Guilt and Punishment, and give us an actual
 Right and Title to Glory, and yet can we not be
 saved without walking in the ways of God? An.
 Concerning *Active and Passive righteousness*, I shall
 say little; but, never flatter your self, without walk-
 ing in the Ways of God you can never be saved.
 For it's plain, That no Thieves, nor Covetous, nor
 Drunkards, nor Revilers, nor Extortioners, shall
 Inherit the Kingdom of God. Qu. But what then
 becomes of Free-Grace? An. It's quite shut out
 of some mens Principles; but as to us, we own it the
 great Spring of all our present enjoyments, and future
 Expectations. Qu. But is not this to Eke out the
 righteousness of Christ with our own? An. I have
 told you, our Holiness is no Patch to Christs Right-
 eousness, but has its Distinct concerns, Peculiar
 uses, and Proper employment, in the Salvation of Be-
 lievers. Qu. Say you so? I protest thou art the
 most Pertinacious, Refractory, and Obstinate Crea-
 ture that ever I Catechised in my life: But I let thee
 know, I am resolved, that they shall hold, in spite
 of their teeth, that Holiness and Obedience, are not
 necessary to Salvation.

Now the short of all this long Discourse, our Au-
 thor gives us in these words: "That to know Christ,
 "is not to be thus acquainted with his Person, but
 "to understand his Gospel in its full Latitude and

"Extent; It's not the Person of Christ, but the
 "Gospel of Christ, which is the Way, the Truth,
 "and the Life. To which I only say, 1. It's a
 strange Definition of *the Knowledge of Christ*, that
 it is, *not to know Him*: To know, is to be Ignorant;
 to see, is to be Blind. 2. It's impossible to under-
 stand *the Gospel in its Latitude*, but we must *thus*
know Christs Person; he has Learnt little that has
 not Learnt *the reconciliation made in the Blood of*
Christs Cross. ∴ Though the Scriptures be *the*
way and Means, yet the *Person of Christ* is the *way*
of Mediation, whereby we come to the Father:
 And though we have *Direction, Instruction, En-*
couragements from the Scripture, to walk in the
 way of Holiness, yet we have *Grace and Ability*
 from the Lord Jesus Christ, who is a *Head of In-*
fluence, as well as Authority, to all that are in Cove-
 nant with him, to walk in that Way.

At length, the Gentleman having Discharged the
 Office of a Catechist, will let us know how terrible
 he is for an Exorcist: He falls a Raving, and Con-
 juring at the *acquaintance with Christ*, that the Can-
 dles seem to burn blew, the Ground to tremble; and
 in this Sulphureous Vehicle, we shall see him Raise
 his Spirit. "Acquaintance with Christs Person is
 "only a work of Fancy, teaches the Arts of Hy-
 pocrisie, undermines the Fundamental Design of
 "the Gospel, makes Men incurably Ignorant, end-
 "less Talkers, insolent Censurers, and every Boy
 "learns to Despise the Ignorance of his Teachers.
 Our Author is Whistling over to himself his wild
 Notes, just like a Black-Bird in the latter end of
 February, that he may not be to seek in March: So
 here he gives us a *Synopsis of Scolding*; the brief
 Heads

Heads of things upon any of which he can Write a Book as long as this: But what is the Matter? Why, Boys despise the Ignorance of their Teachers. I had rather they should despise their Ignorance than their Knowledge: Ay, but they despise them for not knowing Christ, and the Mystery of the Gospel: Alas! you do not pretend to know him, but have described the Knowledge of Christ by Ignorance of him: Oh! but the Laws of Christ will not down with them. At this rate (I believe) they never will: All Reverence to his Laws must cease, when his Person is exposed to Contempt: He that Teaches men to Mock at the Personal Excellencies, Beauty, Loveliness, Fulness of the Law-giver, does more surely, though more slowly undermine the Foundation of Gospel-Obedience, than he that brings his Mattocks to the Commandment it self. The Reader perhaps is not aware what design our Author has upon him: Why, *He hopes that good People will hereafter have better thoughts of him, and his Fellows, that they are not such Strangers to Christ, as they may Imagine; for he has a greater Reverence for him, than to be so Rude and Unmannerly, than to make bold with his Person, and with his Laws.* I could heartily wish, indeed, our Author were no stranger to Christ, (but it's better so than worse) to be Ignorant of Him, may perhaps prove his best Plea for Enmity against Him: For his Boldness, I cannot tell how more unmannerly he could well be; he has divided his *chiefest and most glorious Titles*, whereby the Spirit of God has Recommended him to our best Affections, the Gospel Portraits of *Christ's Loveliness, &c.* he calls *Romantick Descriptions*; he has Overthrown and Confounded, all his Offices,

Cancel'd *the main Ends* of Christ's coming into the World, turn'd all that's Sacred into Drollery, and yet he thinks he has not *made bold enough* with Christ.

From hence he takes occasion to fall into some admiration of *the Church Catechisme*, and the Wisdom of the Church in *feeding her Children there with wholesome and substantial Food*. It will be long enough before he commends the Wisdom of the Church in her Articles, put forth to be the Standard of the Faith of all that are to instruct the Churches Children: I shall entreat our Author, seeing he is so passionately in love with the Catechism, to practise it more; to *keep his Hands from Picking and Stealing*; (for Volkelius, Shlictingius, &c. complain heavily of him;) and *his Tongue from evil speaking, lying, and slandering*; (and herein another sort of men make lamentable Complaints.)

There is *but one thing more*, whereof he will take Notice; and I am heartily glad on't, for I feared when *his hand was in*, there would have been no End of this rayling Humour: But why he should call it *one thing more*, I cannot imagine, when 'tis but the *same strain of Prophane Scoffing* at the Concerns of Religion. But let us hear *that one Thing*: When the Scripture speaks of the Knowledge of Christ, it includes not *only the speculative part of Knowledge, which consists in true Notions*; but the *Virtue and Efficacy of it in the Government of our Lives*. Surely, this is not the *one thing* he would speak to: No, no; These men talk of an *Experimental Knowledge of Christ*: Now he comes to it: *The meaning of which is, that this Acquaintance with Christs Person, warms and heats their Fancies, moves their*

their Passions; sometimes they find great breakings of heart, they melt and dissolve into tears for their sins, when they remember their Lord suffered for them; They see him hang upon the Cross, &c. It requires no great Wit to be Prophane; common Abilities will serve to represent the Truth to disadvantage; he that presumes his Tongue is his own, may let it run ryot without Truth or Honeity.

1. This Acquaintance with Christs Person (says he) *beats their Fancies*. Thus he has told us before, p. 95. That *the workings of the Law, the Offers of Christ*, and our entering into Covenant with him, is but *the working of heated Fancy, and Religious Distraction*; that to speak of *Christs beauty, loveliness, fulness and preciousness*, are but *Romantick Descriptions* of him: That is, *All is Fancy*, that comports not with his own *extravagant Whimsy*. The *Knowledge of Christ*, informs our Judgements, affects our Hearts, reforms our Lives; and it will argue little love to our Redeemer, if we entertain meaner thoughts of him, by loud Clamour, and impotent Reflections upon him.

2. It *moves their Passions*; and if we be a little passionately affected with the love of our Redeemer, it's a pardonable Errour: When our Author would curry favour with his Reader, and perswade him, that for all his scandalous Expressions, he was no Enemy to Christ, he could say as much as that came to, p. 184, 185. *This is a Sacrament wherein we celebrate the Love of our dying Lord, and express our most passionate Love to him*: Here is Love, *passionate*, and *most passionate Love*; and yet others Passions must not be moved, for fear they set the Town on fire.

3. They

3. *They find great breakings of heart.* I would we experienc'd them more, upon Condition we were ten times more reviled for them: but I cannot well conceive, how the Heart should be broken from sin, that is not broken for sin; and though this is grown so despicable a Matter in his eyes, yet we have this Relief, that a broken and contrite heart God will not despise.

4. *But they melt, and dissolve into Tears; when they remember what their Lord suffer'd for them:* They are content he should be called their Lord; if others renounce him, they are willing to own him; It's better to be reproached in this World, that they have a Saviour, than condemned in the next World, because they have none: and let it be their, and all our Cares, that Men may not base us for professing Christ; and God too, because we do but profess him. But is it so heinous a Crime, to weep at the remembrance of what Christ suffer'd for us? We pray that God would fulfill upon us that Promise, Zech. 12. 10. That he would pour out his Spirit upon us, that we may look upon him whom we have pierced, and mourn over him, and for him, as one mourns for an only Son; and we say with Holy Herbert,

*If thou hast no Sighs nor Tears,
Would thou hadst no Sins nor Fears;
Who hath These, Those ill forbears:*

But, 5. *They see him hang upon the Cross, and have all his Agonies, and dying groans in their ears.* Well, if Faith represents to us a crucified Christ, the Galatians were not called foolish upon that Account: When we read that Christ was amazed, and

fore

fore troubled, that his Soul was exceeding sorrowfull, even to death, that it express'd from his Body clods of Blood; all the Question is, whether we ought to Read these things *between sleeping and waking*; or get the most lively and powerfull Impressions of them upon our Souls? The Primitive Church used to pray, *Δὲ ἀγῶνας ἡμεῶν ἐλὼν· libera nos Domine*: And the Present Church of England; *By thine Agony and bloody Sweat, by thy Cross and Passion, good Lord deliver us.*

6. *They Curse their Sins that nayled him there.* The truth is, they do not bless their Sins for crucifying Christ; though he was a Person above our Authors' scorn, that used that Hyperbole, *Felix Peccatum quod peperit Christum*: But sin has proved so dishonourable to our God, so wounding to Christ, so grievous to the Spirit, so bitter to the Conscience, that we would say the worst by it we can, on this side Cursing. And this we have good Authority for, *pag. 185. The Memory of what Christ has done and suffered, excites in us a just Hatred of our sins.* So that, were we but Masters of his Regular Proportions, could we but find the just Measure of the Hatred of sin, and Nick it exactly; betwixt too much, and too little hatred of sin, we might escape the severity of his Censure: Hitherto we have been taught, That the just Measure of loving Christ, is to love him without Measure; and the just Measure of the Hatred of sin, is to hate it without Measure; but our Author (good Man) is very solicitous least we should over-love Christ, or over-hate our iniquities.

7. *They tremble at the Thoughts of the Naturalness of Gods vindictive Justice to him.* And if they doe consider God, as one of *prayer eyes* than to behold Iniquity;

Iniquity; if they do view his Holiness, and in the sense of their own yileness, cry out, *Woe is me, for I am undone, because I am a Man of unclean lips*: As good as they, or he, have trembled at the sight of this Glorious, Holy, and Righteous Judge.

8. But they feel all the Horrors and Agonies of damned Spirits: I knew we should have a Rapper before we had done. Is this the Fruit of Acquaintance with Christ? I question not but a Cain, a Judas, a Spira, may have felt in this Life, something of the horrors of the Damned: The Apostle denounces some such dreadful vengeance against Renegadoes from the Christian Faith; *Heb. 10.* That there remains no more Sacrifice for sin, but a certain fearful looking for of Judgement, and fiery Indignation, to devour the Adversaries, v. 26, 27. But these despairing horrors proceed not from an experimental Knowledge of Christ (as our Author either ignorantly dreams, or maliciously calumniates,) but from an Ignorance of him, the true design of his Death, in Reconciling God and Man: This is one of their Extreame; for at other times they are ravish'd with his Love, charm'd and captivated with his Beauty, refresh'd and ravish'd with his Comforts, &c. It is easie to observe, that our Author alwayes writes *pro re nata*, just as the present occasion invites him; for he will tell you, p. 396. That the Soul many times feels such great and Ravishing delights in all the Acts of Religion, as infinitely excell all the pleasures of Sense; they relish great Pleasure and Satisfaction in the sense of Gods Goodness. P. 397. They must needs feel sometimes such divine Touches, and Impressions, as are the Effects (if I may so speak) of a mutual Love and Sympathy. And had these men

men but the Happiness to have express'd themselves in his very words, and Syllables, they might have said either *the worst or best of Religion*, they had pleased, without Rebuke.

But *all this* (he tells us) *may be no more than the working of a warm and Enthusiastick Fancy*; but then if it should prove *the work of the Holy and Blessed Spirit*, which he ascribes to *Fancy and Conceit*, how near it may come to the sin of those who ascribed that to *Beelzebub*, which was effected by the *Finger of God*, I must leave to his serious Consideration. Enthusiasm is much reproached, and little understood. *Ἐνθουσιασμός ἐστίν, ὅτε ἡ ψυχὴ ὅλην ἐκκαθαρίζεται τῷ ᾧ Θεῷ.* Enthusiasm is, when the Mind is wholly enlightened by God: In which sence I pray God make us all Enthusiasts. And let the End of all that Joy and Satisfaction that we have in Christ, be improved for Obedience; That his Love to us may so powerfully constrain our hearts, that we may wholly live to him that dyed for us, and rose again, who is also at the right hand of God, making Intercession for us. To him be Glory. Amen.

CHAP.

CHAP. IV. Sect. 1.

Of our Union to Christ, and Communion with him.

OUR Author will not in Courtisie, or cannot for Shame deny, that the Scripture does mention such a Relation between Christ and Christians, as may be express'd by an Union; and that these Phrases of [Being in Christ,] and [Abiding in Christ,] can signifie no less. Now this Union to Christ being a very suspicious Phrase, he is deeply concern'd, to mollifie it with some such *Healing Explication*, that it may not prejudice, or however not utterly destroy his main design. To interpret it according to the sound of words, is to blow up himself, with his whole Cause; and therefore it is judg'd a safer way, to accommodate the Expression, if it will be tractable, or to force it, if it proves obstinate, to a Compliance with his own espoused Notions, and preconceived Opinions: And now we see, that the True Reason why he so zealously declaimed against that way of Interpreting Scripture in the last Section, was that he might without suspicion serve himself of it in this. Some do not like his Tottering and Staggering way of wording his Matters: It may be express'd by an Union, and it can signifie no less than an Union: A form

of

of speech invented doubtless to let us know, how unable he is *to deny*, and yet how loath he is *to confess* the plainest Truth. I have not forgot that he told us, p. 108. That *the Scripture describes the Profession of Christianity, a sincere Belief and Obedience to the Gospel, by [Having Christ, and Being in Christ;]* but now he is graciously pleased to *Mount them a little higher*, and is gently content, that they should signify *no less than an Union with Christ*.

Four Notable Observations he makes to us in this one Section.

[1] That *those Metaphors which describe the Relation between Christ and Christians, do primarily referre to the Christian Church, and not to every Individual Christian*. I am sorry that it must still be my great unhappiness to dissent from him, but seeing all Accommodation is desperate, we must bear the thock of his Reasonings as well as we can: Christ (says he) *is called a Head, but he is the Head of his Church, which is his Body, as the Husband is the Head of his Wife; No particular Christian is the Body of Christ, but only a Member in this Body*. This indeed would do pretty well, but that it wants two small Circumstances, *Truth and Pertinency*; which being so inconsiderable, we may well spare in any of His Writings. And,

1. Methinks I want that sorry circumstance of *Truth* in his Argument. Christ is the Head of his Church, as the Husband is Head of his Wife; but the Headship of the Husband over the Wife, will not exactly measure the Headship of Christ over Believers; we must call in assistance from another Similitude, that of the Head in the Natural Body over the

the Members: Christ is a Head of Influence, as well as Authority; he communicates Grace to Obedience, as well as commands Obedience. And this is that the Apostle would teach us, Eph. 4. 15, 16. *The head, even Christ, from whom all the Body fitly joyned together and compact, by that which every joyned supplyeth, according to the effectual working, in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the Body, to the edifying of it self in love. Here's an effectual Operation in every part, the Growth and Increase of every individual Member, by virtue of that Influence which the Head communicates to it: And now to make the Husbands headship over the Wife, to represent the whole of Christs Headship, is craftily to seduce us from the Consideration of that Grace which from Christ we receive, to help us in time of need. The Holy Ghost has singled out the most per, and perspicuous Metaphors, that outward things would afford, to instruct us in the Nature of that Union, and Relation that Believers have to Christ, the Priviledges and Advantages which they receive thereby, and those Duties which indispensably arise from thence; and yet such is the incorrigible and untractable Nature of all outward things, such is their shortness, poverty, and narrowness, that they do not yield a Similitude that will adæquately, and commensurately express the total of Christs Grace, Mercy and Authority, or of our mutual Obligations and Duty. Much of the Poverty and Beggari-ness of the Mosaical Types, lay in this, (those *ἡσυχὰς συζητῆς*, Gal. 4. 9.) that they could not represent Jesus Christ to the life, whom yet it was their design in some measure to shadow out. And when I have named a shadow, I have given a sufficient Reason of*

of my Assertion; for though a *shadow* may describe the general Lineaments of its Body, yet it will not paraphrase upon the *Complexion*: To supply this defect, it has pleased the Wisdom of God to institute that numerous train of Types, that so what could not be express'd by any one, might yet in parcels be described by Another. Hence is it, that one Type represents the Death of Christ as a Sacrifice for Sin; as the Goat of the Sin-offering, Lev. 16. 15. Another, the Intercession of Christ at the right hand of the Father; as Aarons appearing in the Most Holy place upon the Feast of Expiation: The same Wisdom has it pleased the Spirit of God to exercise, in describing to us the Union and Relation betwixt Christ and Believers; for, seeing that no one single Metaphor, however borrowed from the nearest, and most intimous Relation upon Earth, could possibly convey to our understandings all that Mercy, Grace and Love, which from Christ issues to all that are in Covenant with him; nor all that Reverence, Love and Duty, which from Believers is due to a Redeemer; therefore has he chosen out many, that so by putting together the Mercy and Duty which is comprehended in each, we might spell out the Meaning of what is wrapt up in that Relation wherein we stand to him. But,

2. It wants *Pertinency* as well as Truth: For, what if no particular Christian be the Body of Christ. yet is he a Member of that Body; and Christ, as Head of that Body, is related in particular to him, without the Intervention of the Body. A Body is nothing else but the result of all the Integral parts put together in their due *Seite*, and proper Order: and the Church is nothing else but the aggregate of many

many Christians united under their proper Pastor: And as the Head in the Natural Body is immediately related to all the parts, so is Christ immediately related to every true Christian. If then he will argue thus, No particular Christian is the Body, therefore Christ is primarily related to the Body; any one with as much honesty may inferre, Every particular Christian is a Member of Christ, therefore, Christ is primarily related to every particular Christian: And thus the Conclusion will be as far to seek as ever; Whether this Metaphor of a Head does primarily referre to the whole Body, or particular Members. But let us go on: Christ is called a Husband, (says he) but then the whole Church, not every particular Christian, is his Spouse, as St. Paul tells the Church of Corinth, 2 Cor. 11, 2. I have espoused you to one Husband, that I may present you a chaste Virgin to Christ. To which renowned Argument, I have many things to oppose. 1. If the Church of Corinth was the Spouse of Christ, then the Church of Ephesus, that of Coloss, that at Philippi, and to be sure the Church of Rome, will put in their claims with equal right to that Title; and then what becomes of what he asserts, p. 144. Christ is a great Enemy to Poligamy, and has but one Spouse. Is it not great pity a Conceit so ingenious, should have its Neck broken at the first Encounter? And, 2. If Christ hath but one Spouse, and yet every particular Church be his Spouse; it's but crumbling the Metaphor into more minute particles, and then he may be a Husband to every individual Believer. 3. The Text proves not that Christ has but one Spouse, but that the Church hath but one Husband; I have espoused you to one Husband. 4. Though the Metaphor

Metaphor may perhaps more fitly express Christs Relation to particular Churches, than particular Believers; yet this hinders not, but that *Christ* may be primarily related to particular Believers; For the *Metaphor* does not express the Order of Christs Relation, but the Relation itself. The word Church is only a Term of Art, which expresses the same Persons collectively, who distributively taken, are each immediately related to Christ. Again, *Christ* (says he) is a Shepherd, and the Christian Church is his Flock, for the Relation between Shepherd and Sheep, doth primarily concern the whole Flock, This is but one Doctors opinion at most, and will hardly mount it up to the Credit of Probability. For, 1. A Shepherd may be related to one single Sheep; and that one is enough to keep alive, and maintain the Relation; one Sheep will denominate him a Shepherd, though there must be more than one to constitute a Flock. As there was a first Man, related to God, as a Creature to his Creator, before there was A Church; so there was a first Disciple, a first Believer, or Convert, and that one under the Pastoral Charge and care of Christ the great Shepherd, *ipso facto*, as a sincere Convert, and sound Believer; and yet that Individual would not make a Society under Bishops or Pastors. 2. A Flock is made up of many Sheep; now that which constitutes, is at least in order of Nature before the thing constituted: The whole is made up of parts; and I have been taught to presume, that the parts are in order of Nature before the whole: A Shepherd does not muster a company of howling Wolves, and roaring Lyons, and then by that Collection make them a Flock of Sheep; but he gathers

particular Sheep together, unites them into one Fold, and thereby they become a Flock. The way of Christ is not, to amass a Medley of debauched Varlets and Scoundrels, and by making them a Church, make them Christians; but he seeks out for his own Service, particular Christians, and out of these Materials he forms his Church. Again: Christ (says he) *is the Rock, upon which his Church is built, and the Christian Church is a Holy Temple.* Let him take it for granted, if it will do him any service; but is *this Rock, this Foundation, this Corner-stone*, related primarily to the Building, or to the particular Stones? The Apostle Peter, who was a wife Master-builder in Church-work, understood the Method much better: *1 Pet. 2. 5. To whom coming ye are, a Living Stone; ye also as lively Stones, are built up a Spiritual House:* Hence ordinary understandings would conclude, that *the building* did not make *the materials*; but *the materials* made *the building*; the *Spiritual House* did not make the *Lively Stones*, but the *Lively Stones* made the *Spiritual House*: Such Language the Apostle durst use; *these lively Stones* were first united to the *living Corner-stone*, and the product of all was, a beautiful Fabrick: And thus was *Solomon's Temple* built; *the materials* were exactly fitted, and squared for their respective uses and places, and there was nothing to doe but to joyn them together, and out of those (after seven years Labour) there grew up a *Holy Temple*: Had He built of *Bricks*, the Edifice would never have converted them into *lively Stones*; and had he used onely *Sycamores*, they had never been turned into *Cedars* by being Sleepers in the wall. I must therefore abate him an Ace or two of his

his general Conclusion: *All these Metaphors in their first, and most proper use, referre to the whole Society of Christians.* In *Isa. 9. 6.* Christ is called the *Everlasting Father*, which Metaphor (if it be a Metaphor) does primarily expresse the Relation of Christ to *every adopted child*, and not the Relation of Christ to *Children* in gross, and in the Lump: A Father is as really so to *one child*, as to *Twenty*; he may be a Father to *more*, but not *more* a Father. It will sound harshly in the Ears of any that have not lost them under the Cataracts of *Nilus*: to say, That *Father* does not primarily describe the Relation of *Philip* (*v. g.*) to *Alexander, John, &c.* but to *children*, in the first place, and then at *second hand*, and through a remove or two, to *Alexander* and *John*. Thus is the *Everlasting Father* primarily related to *every childe*, by virtue of his Adoption, and Regeneration; and *secondarily* to them all as *brethren*, related to one another, living under the same Discipline, and Laws of the Family.

[2.] He observes further to us for our Learning: That the *Union of particular Christians to Christ*, is by *Means of their Union to the Christian Church*: Which he as Learnedly proves from *1 Cor. 12. 27.* *We are the Body of Christ, and Members in Particular.* Where the strength of this Argument lies, I confess, I see not: That the *Church of Corinth* was the *Body of Christ*, That I plainly see: That *every particular Member of that Church*, was a *Member of Christ*; I think I see that too: But that it was *therefore a Member of Christ*, because it was *United to that Body of the Church of Corinth*; I own my *Dulness*, that I cannot see: And I have some scruples that makes me *Halt*, and not so *Nimble*

go on both Feet into our Authors Opinion. For, 1. If particular Christians by being United to the Body, become the Members of Christ, then what Medium of Union have these particular Churches to Unite them to Christ? We poor Folks of the *Luzy* have an Expedient found out to Unite us to Christ, namely, by Uniting us to the Church under the Bishops, and Pastors: But what shall become of the Bishops and Pastors themselves? What Provision is made for them? VWhich way shall they be United to Christ? Some (indeed) talk of Uniting them by their *Metropolitans*, and them again by their *Patriarchs*, and then these by the *Pope*: But who shall Unite him, poor man? I see here's a Design laid to prove the *Pope* to be *Antichrist*. 2. VWhen a Church is first Collected, I am perplexing myself how the first Convert, the first Believer comes to be United to Christ, when there is never a Church existing by which he should be United: And it troubles me to think, what a long while that unhappy Creature may be Holy, and very Religious, and yet cannot be united to Christ, because others will not consent to become a Church; and thus he must necessarily perish, though he be thus Holy, and Devout, because others will not go to Heaven with him. But, 3. VVe must suppose, that Baptism Unites us to the Visible Church: Now, either this single Person was United to Christ before his Baptism, or not: If he was, then the Cause is lost; for then Union with the Visible Church, is not the only Means of our Union to Christ. If not, then, 1. What a sad Generation of Wretches must be the Ingredients of a Church? And some will define it, as others have made it; A Cote of unclean Birds, and

and a Hold of every filthy and unclean Spirit. And then, 2. It will be the unquestionable Duty of the Pastors of the Church, to admit into the Society, the most Profligate Rascals, that offer themselves: For what would you have them do? Shall they be so Barbarous and Inhumane, such bloody Murderers of Souls, to deny them *the only Means* of their Union to Christ? And what would you have the poor wicked wretches do? Repent, and believe, and turn from their sins? Alas! all's to no purpose, they can never be United to Christ, - without *the only Means* of Union; were they as Meek as *Moses*, as Patient as *Job*, as Believing as *Abraham*, they are never the nearer Christ; and therefore as good come Loaden with all their Villanies, and Triumphing in their Rogueries, and be but united to the Church, and all in good time, they may come to be United to Christ: But surely the Church of *England* has Instructed her Children otherwise. I shall not press our Author with the *Articles*, because he's no great admirer of them; but because he so adores the Catechism, I shall remit him thither for Satisfaction. *Qu. What is required of Persons to be Baptised? Ans.* "Repentance, whereby they forsake sin; and Faith, whereby they stedfastly believe the Promises of God made to them in that Sacrament. If now *such a Faith, such a Repentance*, as are here described, must qualify a Person for Baptism, that he may be *United thereby to the Church*, and so to Christ; I would gladly learn, whether *such a faith, and such a repentance*, will not serve to Unite him to Christ, antecedent to his Baptism? And if not, whether the Church can contribute any more to his Union with him?

Another Reason of our Authors, proceeds thus: *The Church is Christs Flock, and every Christian who is of this Fold, is one of Christs Sheep.* In good time! but is he *therefore, and onely therefore,* one of Christs Sheep because he is *one of this Fold?* Or rather taken into the *Fold,* because he was *first one of Christs Sheep?* But if indeed this be the real way to Create sheep, by taking any thing that has *four Legs* into the *Fold,* it will be a Noble piece of Charity to revive the *Tribute of Wolves;* and if the Breed should be worn out in *England,* we know from whence to recruite the *Sheepfold;* but still he proceeds, and I perceive he has a mind to prove something if he knew what. *The Church is Christs Spouse, every Christian is a Member of that Society, which Christ owns for his Spouse, but every Christian is not Christs Spouse.* No? Why not? Now comes the Knocking-argument: *He is a great enemy to Poligamy, and hath but one Spouse.* Wonderful! So is Christ a great Enemy to Monsters, and Prodigies, and has but *one Body:* And yet for all this, our Author could allow the *Church of Corinth,* to be *his Spouse,* to be *his Body,* and then I will allow the *Church of Smyrna,* to have been his *Body,* and *his Spouse,* and others (as their affections lead them) will no doubt allow other particular Churches to be *his Body, his Spouse;* and then Christ shall have as many particular *Bodies,* and *Spouses,* as there are particular Churches upon the Face of the Earth; and so this Doughty argument Vanishes into Smoak, and nothing: and in lieu of it, I will offer him another. It's impossible to be *United to Christ,* without the *only Means* of *Union,* but it's possible to be *United to Christ,* without being

being United to a particular Church, therefore to be United to a particular Church, is not the only Means of Uniting us to Christ. The former Proposition we will for once humbly beg at his hands, and do not doubt but he will charitably grant it; the second is Evidenced from hence: When particular Churches are broken in pieces by Persecution, or otherwise, yet the true believing Members are not thereby separated from Christ; they cease not to be Christs Friends, because the World is their Enemy: Yea indeed (says our Author, pag. 165.) If there be no Visible Society (as it may happen in time of Persecution) it must of necessity alter the Case. That is in plain English; his Discourse had been Strong, if it had not been Weak; and our Union to the Church had been the only Means of our Union to Christ, but for one ill favoured Business, that there is another Means of our union to him, and we may be united to him without it. I grant (indeed) with much readiness, that it is our unquestionable Duty, and when all Circumstances concur, our Indispensible Duty for every Christian to joyn himself to some particular Church; the Command of Christ has made it so: The Edifying our own Souls in Faith, Love, Comfort, adds to that necessity; the Glorifying of our God, and our Redeemer, in a visible Profession of, and Subjection to all his Ordinances, heightens that Necessity; the enjoyment of many Gospel Ordinances which presuppose a Church-state, add more weight to the Necessity, and that our Union with Christ has more Bonds laid upon it, by this means, I freely own; but that our Union with the Church, is the only means to Unite us to Christ, I must see better Arguments to prove it, before I know

know how to believe it: Our Union with Christ, is by *Invisible and Internal* Ligaments, and if there were no other, than what a *Visible Church* can afford, I do not see, but all Christians are Obligated to be Hypocrites. The great Promises of the Gospel, those of Justification, Adoption, and Sanctification, are made to *Individuals*, and how to apply them to *whole Churches*, otherwise than by the *Individuals*, is unconceivable: They are *single Persons*, that are Justified, Sanctified, Adopted, Pardoned, and Saved, and not a Complex Notion, which is only an Operation of the Mind conceiving of singular things, as they relate one to another.

There is yet one Text of Scripture, which our Author has reserved as the *Triar*, to the main Battle; and though his *Jelites* be Cut off, and his Body shaken, yet so long as his Reserves are entire, and unbroken, he cannot be totally Routed. The place is, *John 15. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5. I am the true Vine, and my Father is the Husbandman. — Abide in me, and I in you. As the Branch cannot bear Fruit except it abide in the Vine, no more can ye except ye abide in me.* Now because he lays such a Stress upon, and places all his Hopes and Confidence in this place, I shall particularly Examine, 1. His Interpretation. 2. His Reasons for that Interpretation. 3. The Use he makes of this Interpretation.

(1.) For his Interpretation, it has more Facets than *Janus*; and more Colours than the Rainbow. *I am the true Vine: Where [I] signifies Christ together with his Church: There's one Face.* But pag. 146. He repents that ever he took the *Person of Christ* into the Paraphrase, for fear some ill disposed persons should make an ill use on't, and therefore he Glosses it thus: *I am the true Vine, that*

is the Church: So [I] is grown a Church. But yet that neither will not answer all his Occasions, nor stop all Gaps, and therefore it must put on another shape: pag. 147. *When Christ speaks in the first Person [I] he cannot mean this of his own Person, but of his Church, Doctrine, and Religion:* And yet for all this it will not do the Feat, but it must pass through one Metamorphosis more, and it signifies, *a sincere and hearty Belief of the Gospel.* So here we have got the *Act* and the *Object* Married together in this one word [I:] A man would conclude he had found at last *Aristoteles Materia Prima*, it's *Omnia formarum capax*: Nothing in *Act*, but every thing in *Power*, a piece of soft Wax, that's plyable to any Impression, a mere blank Paper, you may Write down your own Conditions: But what is meant by the *Vine*? Why that's the Church too, pag. 146. *That is, the Church, which is founded on the belief of my Gospel, is the only true Church:* Or, *I am the Vine*, that is, the Church is the Church; but let us proceed. *He that abideth in me:* [In me] that is, *the Christian Church:* [I in him,] that is, *the Christian Doctrine;* For without me, you can do nothing: That is, without a sincere belief of my Gospel. And now he presumes he has laid his Matters so Closely, Evenly, and Regularly together, that he may defie the Cunning of the most expert Caviller to disturb them. And yet to deal openly with him, he has not lead me Captive by his fair Colours and regular Proportions. For, 1. I find his way of Interpretation meerly *Arbitrary*, such as has no other Foundation but the *Sovereign will* of the Commentator; he deals with Scripture as if it were his perfect *Vassal*, and he the absolute *Monarch*

narch of the Word of God; and that his Paraphrase knew no other Language than his *Carre est nostre plaisir*: For such is our Will and Pleasure. Let the Reader take but a taste: *He that abideth in me, and I in him.* Where [Me] must signifie the Christian Church, and [I] the Christian Doctrine. For we must know for our Learning, that [Me] in the Ablative case, must always signifie a Church; but [I] in the Nominative case, that's the Christian Doctrine. And if any peevish Fellow shall Object that it's a huge Wonder that such a slight Variation of the Case, should alter the Signification. Every puiſny Shool-Boy will inform him, that the varying the Case, does wonderfully alter the Case. Now had it been Referred to a Hundred Systematical, Heavy-headed Divines, they would have concluded, One and All; that if [I] signifie a Doctrine, [Me] will signifie the same: And if [Me] signifie a Church, [I] will signifie neither better nor worse, but a Church too; but when a Zaphnath Paaneab, a Revealer of Secrets, shall take the Matter in hand, he will shew you the difference. 2. Another Exception I have against this Interpretation, is, That Christ has often spoke in the first Person, He has compared himself to many other things, and yet never intended any thing by [I] but his own Self, *John 10. 11. I am the good Shepherd.* And besides that, we have had our Authours Suffrage to it, the thing it self makes it evident that Christ speaks there neither of Church, nor Doctrine. The Fold, must signifie the Church: The Pasture, will answer the Doctrine, and Christians they are the Sheep, but Christ himself is the Shepherd. And yet one signification more for this poor [I] will do the business, let it signifie the Pastors and Bishops, and that will heal all.

And

And I do not doubt when he has need of them, he can find a Dozen more significations of that one word, that one Letter [I.] Again, *John 10. 7*, Christ says, *I am the Door*. Now *the Church* is evidently *the House*, or *Temple*, and so [I] will not do very well for *Church*, in that place: And *the Doctrine*, is *the Orders*, and *Rules for Government* of the House; and therefore we had not best make [I] signifie *Doctrine* neither, in this place: Oh! but then (and it was well thought on) *Baptism is a Sacrament of Admission into the Church*, and then it will run as Glib upon the Tongue as may be, *I am the Door*; that is, *Baptism is the Door*. But what shall we say to *John 6. 48*. *I am the Bread of Life*. Oh! that is wondrous easie, and the Interpretation natural, and without straining; that is, *My Doctrine is the Bread of Life*, which answers *the Manna*. But then Christ tells us, *ver. 51*. *That the Bread which he will give is his Flesh, which he will give for the Life of the World*. What shall become of us now? Why our Author must take advice with his Pillow about this Difficulty, and let it signifie any thing in the World; *Black or Blew*, provided it do not signifie *the Person of Christ*, and the Interpretation is authentick, and by to Morrow-morning, shall shine with it's own Light. 3. This Interpretation avows false Doctrine. He had told us: That by *He that abideth in me*, is meant, he that *abideth in the Christian Church*. And our Saviour assures us, *ver. 5*. *That without [Me] ye can do nothing*. Now in just proportion to his Interpretation, the sence must run thus: *Without you be in the Christian Church, it's impossible ye should do any thing that is good*. And how notoriously false this is of a particular Church, is evident, how many particular Churches

Churches have been dissolved; *The Shepherd scattered, and the Sheep scattered*, and yet the Individuals have brought forth Fruit in patience. Our Author should have considered this a little better: Why so he has. *Without me ye can do nothing*; that is, *Without such a sincere and hearty belief of my Gospel*. Well, but we were told, that by [*Me*] was meant *the Church*: And we took it for granted, that if we met with it in the *Ablative case*, it ought to signify *the Church*; And must it now signify *the Doctrine*? How often has the Wind turned in half an hour? Oh! but you are to understand, that, then it was in the 4th. ver. *Abide in me*: But this is in the 5th. verse, *Without me*. And so the Rule will be this; That whensoever you find it in the *Ablative case*, in the 4th. verse of any Chapter, then it signifies *the Church*; but if it fall out to be the *Ablative case*, and the 5th. verse, then believe it, you shall do well to Interpret it by *Gospel or Doctrine*. But still here's an odd Scruple behind; For what will become of ver. 4? *Abide in Me, and I in you*. As the Branch cannot bear Fruit of it self, except it abide in the Vine, no more can ye, except ye abide in Me. Now our Authors Gloss is this, [*abide in Me,*] continue in the Church; and [*I in you,*] let my Doctrine continue in you. And then the following words must be thus Paraphrased: *As the Branch cannot bear Fruit of it self, except it abide in the Vine, no more can ye except ye [abide in the Church:]* Which spoken of a particular Church, is utterly false; and there's no help left, but only this standing Rule: That [*Me*] in the beginning of a verse, signifies a Church; but in the latter end of a verse, it always signifies a Doctrine. And then the 5th.

verse

verse too, will be as plain as a Pike-staff: *He that abideth in me, that is, in the Church; and I in him, that is, the Doctrine in him; the same bringeth forth much Fruit: for without me; that is, without a sincere and hearty belief of my Doctrine (or to disguise it a little, say Gospel) it's impossible you should do any thing that is good: And surely, never was a small piece of Armour better placed, nor to better purpose, by the Wit of Man. I have done with his Interpretation, but that I cannot forbear to give the Reader the Summe of what he has said: That Church which owns my Doctrine, is the true Vine: and all you who make a publick profession of Faith in me, (i.e. of a belief of my Gospel) and live in Communion with one another, are the Branches of this Vine; and whosoever of you continue steadfast in this Profession, and Communion, and do not only make a visible profession of Faith in me, but suffer my Doctrine and Precepts to dwell and abide in you too, to Govern your Wills and Affections, and direct your Conversations in the World, all such of you will be very Fruitful in good Works. And it's very likely to be true, for it would be a great wonder if they whose Wills, and Affections, and Conversations, are Govern'd by the Word of Christ, should do nothing that's good; because most things in the World, are what they are, excepting only Christ's Person, which shall signifie, Many, Divers, Contrary Things, and in short, any Thing besides Himself.*

(2.) His Interpretation being so *Arbitrary, Precarious, Self-Inconsistent, and Ridiculously false*, I need not much trouble my self with his Reasons; nor should I, but that they also discover its *Unreasonableness*.

ness. Reason 1. *The Jewish Church is frequently in the Old Testament called a Vine, Isa. 5. 1. I will sing to my Beloved a Song concerning his Vineyard. My Beloved had a Vineyard: Judge between me and my Vineyard.* And now he must be very blind, that does not see *the Church is compared to a Vine*; though some will be so Peevish, as to fancy some small difference between a *Vine*, and a *Vineyard*. But yet it is called a *Vine*, Jer. 2. 21: Very true: Ergo, What? Why therefore Christ is not compared to a *Vine*, in the New Testament. And therefore it must signifie Doctrine, Gospel, Religion, and Twenty things more. But, 1. Tell me seriously: Did God, or any of the Prophets, ever say, *I am the Vine*; and then teach the Jews to dissent thus upon it? That is, *The Church which is founded on the belief of Moses his Doctrine, is the only true Church*. When the Prophet will describe *the Church by a Vine*, he tells you expressly *what he intends*; and there's an end of all Controversie. And so would our Saviour if ever he intended to be understood, till a happy Head should, after Sixteen Hundred Years, light upon the Mystery. Ay, but *the Christian Church is expressly called an Olive Tree, and the Members of it called Branches*, Rom. 11. 17, 18. Expressly? And must we then split against that Rock, and Interpret the place, by the express the sound of words? Two things let him consider at his Leisure, 1. Whether it be the Christian Church that is there compared to the Olive-Tree. 2. Whether it be said, that *Christ is the Olive-Tree*: Which expression if he can produce, and then make it out, that *[I] am the Olive-Tree*, signifies *the Church is so*; we will then freely confess he has bid-

den

den fair towards a probability for the truth of his Interpretation. 2. Because God is called the Husbandman, who takes care to Dress this Vine, which cannot be understood of Christ, but of the Church. This Reason seems to carry some civility towards Jesus Christ, and therefore deserves a fairer Treatment than the strength of it can challenge. Let this suffice: The Father is called *ἡ ἀγαθή*, the Husbandman, in respect of the Branches of the Vine, *ver. 2. Every branch that beareth Fruit, he purgeth, that it may bring forth more Fruit; and every branch that beareth not Fruit, he taketh away.* 3. Christ speaks of such branches in him as bear no fruit: Now there can be no such branches in the Person of Christ, for our very Union to Him will make us Fruitful. *Ans.* Many things are said to be, which only seem to be. There's nothing more ordinary than for appearances, to wear the Livery of Realities: Hypocrites are said to be in Christ *καὶ οὐκ ἐσιν*, who are not so *οὐκ ἐσιν* *ἀλλ' ἔσονται*, Acts 8. 15, 16. Simon Magus is said to believe, who yet was in the Gall of Bitterness, and in the bond of Iniquity: Rotten, Dead Branches may have a visible station in the Vine, and yet derive no nourishment from the Vine; and visible Professors may be said to be in Christ, in a judgment of Charity, which thinks no evil where none appears; and hopeth all things, where there is ground of hope. Our Saviour prescribes a Rule how we must judge, who have no direct Cognizance of the heart; when he himself takes other Measures of Men, and needeth not that any should testify of Man, for he knows what is in Man. 4. To confirm all this, and prevent Objections, It's evident (says he) from the Chapter, that Christ when he

speaks in the First Person [I,] and [in Me,] cannot mean this of his own Person, but of his Church, Doctrine, and Religion. But where lies the Evidence of this great Demonstration? Why Christ says, I am the true Vine, and ye are the Branches; He that abideth in me, and I in him, bringeth forth much Fruit, for without me you can do nothing. Well, what of all this? Why, our Author would willingly Learn what sense can be made of all this, if we understand it of the Person of Christ: And I will as willingly Teach him, if he be not too proud to Learn, I Jesus Christ, the Mediator of the New Covenant, am very fitly compared to a Vine; and ye my Disciples are as fitly compared to the Branches of a Vine. Now he that really abideth in me by a true lively faith, and I in him by the Quickening Operations of my Spirit, the same bringeth forth much Fruit of holy Obedience; for without derivation of Grace from Me your Root, you can do nothing that is truly good, and acceptable to God. Oh! but he has two or three formidable Objections against this Interpretation. 1. It's not very Intelligible, How we can be, or abide in Christ's Person? No more it is: If we bring Capernaistical understandings along with us, who Puzzled their Heads with a gross Notion of Carnal eating the Flesh, and drinking the Blood of Christ. If by [being in Christ] were understood, a Local, Physical, or Natural being in Him, it were somewhat Unintelligible, but when no more is meant by it, but that every true Believer is by Constitution of the Covenant of Grace, one Person morally with Christ; so considered and dealt with by God, there's no more insuperable Difficulty, than what unbelief will

will create in the clearest Truths of the Gospel. But, *It's more unintelligible still; How we can be in the Person of Christ, and the Person of Christ at the same time be in us; Which is a new piece of Philosophy, called Penetration of Dimensions.* But there's no great danger in that: Christ may dwell in us by his Spirit, and we in him by Faith, and yet Faith and the Spirit, never disturb each other in their Motions; but what the Dimensions of the Soul, in its actings of Faith, or of the Spirit in it's working of Grace are, this I confess, is to me unintelligible: And that a Christian should be in the Church, and the Church at the same time be in a Christian, had been equally Unintelligible, and as much danger of the Penetration of Dimensions: But that our Author stumbled upon a happy Expedient; that [I] should signify a Doctrine, and [Me] a Church, to heal the Contradiction. 3. That our Fruitfulness should depend on our Union to Christ, is as hard to my understanding. Truly, I cannot help that, I have no Medicine to cure Crazyed Intellectuals: He that cannot understand that Believers do receive Actual assistance from Christ by his Spirit, to help them in the way of their Duty, and to encourage them against the Difficulties they meet withal in their Duties, cannot (I presume) understand very many Lines in the Gospel.

(3.) Our last Task is, to Examine what improvement he has made of this Interpretation, and in short it is this: *That the Union of particular Christians to Christ, consists in their Union to the Christian Church.* And now I am abundantly satisfied, that our Author is a very Philomet, *Vox & preterea nihil*; One, whose Volubility of Tongue,

and Pen, supplies the place of Argument, and Demonstration: I hope our Author will not meet with many Readers, who have so far parted with their Memories, as not to remember what that was he Propounded to himself to Evince; *viz. That the Union of particular Christians to Christ, is by means of their Union with the Christian Church*: And yet now when he comes to cast up his Accounts, we have gotten another Conclusion; *That the Union of particular Christians to Christ, consists in their Union to the Christian Church*. Surely, the Purblind will espie some small difference: *Eating is a means to Living*, yet none but a Swine of Epicurus his Sty, will say, that *Living* consists in *Eating*. The High-road is a means to bring the Traveller Home; yet it will be hard to perswade us, that *being at Home*, consists in *Travelling*: Trading is a mean to Riches, yet *Riches* do not formally consist in *Trading*: The end may possibly be separated from the Means, but nothing can be separated from that thing wherein it consists. But let that pass: If he has proved either the one, or the other, I am content he be reputed an Artist. The thing he has a good will to prove, is: *That the Union of particular Christians to Christ, is either by means of their Union to the Christian Church; or else that it consists in it*. Now for the Proof of this: He has told us, *That the Church is the Body of Christ*: The Church is the Temple of Christ: The Church is the Spouse of Christ: The Church is the Flock of Christ. And had it been referred to a thousand Persons, not one but would have thought, that, *that Christ* who is the Head of that Body, is a Person: He that is the Husband of that Spouse, is a Person:

He

He that is the *Shepherd* of the Flock, is a *Person* : and He that *Dwells* in that Temple, is a *Person* : But things are not so far gone, but our Author shall have his Opinion, and choose what he will abide by ; for my part I am much unconcern'd, let him please himself, he shall not displease me at all. Say then ; Shall it be *Christs Doctrinal*, or *Christs Ecclesiastical*, that is the *Head* of this *Body* ? The *Husband* of this *Spouse* ? The *Shepherd* of this *Flock* ? I can rest satisfied. But then the Sence runs thus : A *Doctrine*, or a *Church*, is the *Head* of the *Church* : A *Doctrine*, or a *Church*, is the *Husband* of the *Church* : A *Doctrine*, or a *Church*, is the *Shepherd* of the *Church*. If this does not please him, let him try the other way, and allow it to be a *Person* that is all these. A *Person*, that is the *Head*, *Husband*, and *Shepherd* of the *Church* : And now I must plainly acquaint him, That he has Entangled his Affairs in such confusion, that he will never be able to Extricate them. For, 1. If the *Person* of *Christ* be here intended, then it seems at last, whatever the means be of that *Union*, yet there is an *Union* to the *Person* of *Christ* ; and whereinsoever that *Union* consists, yet such an *Union* there is ; How absurd would it be, to enquire whether our *Union* to *Christs Person*, consists in our *Union* with a particular *Church* ? If *Union* to *Christs Person* be a *Non-entity* ? Or, Whether our *Union* with a particular *Church*, be the means to our *Union* with *Christ* ? If there be no such thing ? And then, 2. He is as much concern'd, as his poor Neighbours, to salve the Difficulties of being in *Christs Person* ; and yet at the same time, *Christs Person* being in us ; of the depending of our Fruitfulness upon that

Union, with whatever other Incongruities a strong Fancy may impute to it. And then 3. If the Person of Christ be intended in the Question, then his last and tedious Argument from John 15. 1. which he has managed with so much Industry, upon which he has bestowed so much Cost, and in which he places so much Confidence, concludes something very near to Nothing: For the Abstract of his Medium is this, that Christians are in the Church; which will never conclude, that therefore our Union to a particular Church is the Means of our Union to Christ, much less, that our Union to Christ consists in it.

From the Scriptures we are posted over to the Ancient Fathers; who (if we may believe him) Interpret all those Metaphors which decypher the Union between Christ and Christians to signify, the Love and Unity of Christians among themselves. He that will reproach his own Mother, will not much Reverence the Fathers: They do indeed argue from the Unity between Christ and Christians, to an absolute Necessity of Unity between Christians themselves, they are members of one body, under one common Head, and therefore it presses sore upon them, that there be no intestine Broyls among themselves: they are Sheep of the same Fold, under one Shepherd, and it were unnatural for Sheep to devour one another, which is the Province of Wolves; they are subjects in the same spiritual Kingdom, under Christ the Sovereign Monarch of the Church, and therefore all heats and animosities, all feuds and broyls, are alien from that place and Relation, they fill up towards Christ, and each other: So the Fathers, so the Scriptures argue, Mal. 2. 10. Have we not all one Father? hath not one God created us?

why

why do we deal treacherously every man against his brother? The Process of the Argument is very clear, if we be *Children of one Father*, we ought to love our *Brethren*; but to conclude from thence, that *A Childs Relation to his Father* consists in the *Love and Unity of the Children among themselves*, is somewhat more than ridiculous. Thus from the *Union between Christ and Christians*, there is an answerable Argument drawn for the *Unity of Christians amongst themselves*; but that the *Union of Christians with Christ*, does formally consist in their mutual Agreement and Concord each with other, is a piece of Logick for which we are indebted to our Author; but thus *Chrysostom* expounds Eph. 2. 19, 20, 21. where the *Apostle* speaks of that spiritual building which is erected on the Foundation of the *Prophets and Apostles*, *Jesus Christ* [himself *ἀντὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*], being the chief Corner-stone, to signify the *Unity of the Church in all Ages*, that both the *Jewish*, and the *Christian Church* are united in *Christ*, as the several parts of the building are kept together by the *Corner-stone*. Now though *Chrysostom* be little beholden to our Author for traducing his honest meaning, yet we are all beholden to *Chrysostom*. For then, 1. There have not been so many sorts of Churches in the World, as he would perswade us, but both *Jews* and *Christians* constitute one universal catholic Church, though differing in the Oeconomy, and some variety of Administration; both the *Jewish* and *Christian Church* are the several parts of one and the same Building. And then, 2. The *Jews*, we may presume, knew something at least of *Christ*, what he was to be to them, what he was to do for them, if they and we,

Jews and Gentiles in all Ages are United in him, To the same purpose St. Ambrose: (Yes I believe it; as little to our Authors purpose as St. Chrysostom;) *Duas Populas in se suscepit Christus Salvator, & fecit unum in Domino, sicut Lapis Angularis duas parietes continet in Unitate Domus firmatas*: which our Author Englishes thus: Christ united two People in himself, and made them one in the Lord, as the Corner-stone unites two Walls in a building, and makes it but one House. Now if we cannot agree about the Construing a piece of familiar Latine, we shall strangely differ in the Interpretation of its design and tendency: And here Ambrose is less beholden to our Author than Chrysostom; for, that he may not cross our Authors sence, he is made to speak Non-sence. Christ united two people, and made them one: That is, he made them one, and made them one; or he united them, and united them; for, what uniting should be, but making one, I cannot divine. But Ambrose his Latine runs thus: *Duos populos in se suscepit, & fecit unum in Domino*. He took two people upon himself, and (so) made them one in the Lord: He bore their Iniquities, carried their sins in his body upon the Cross, and thereby reconciled them to God, and then their reconciliation to one Another would be easie: but our Author, (who is never wanting to his Concerns) was not at leisure to take notice of that: However (says he) this is the plain design of the place, to prove, that Christ hath taken away the enmity which was between Jew and Gentile, and hath reconciled them both to God. Well, I can be content it should be the Plain design, but not the Main design; not the whole design of the place: Some men think themselves won-

drous

drous witty in the Contrivance, that they have found out some *Reconciling* work for Christs Death: But then it must not be, to reconcile God and Sinners, but to remove an old grudge between Jew and Gentile; (which is an Invention of the latter dayes, utterly unknown to the Ancient Fathers, and the whole Catholick Church,) that they might not seem to say, there's no *Reconciliation* by the Blood of Christ: I would turn over our Author for satisfaction in this point to the *Reason*, not the *Authority* of Dr. E. *Stillings* against *Crellius*, p. 558. A Difference being supposed between God and Man, on the account of sin, no reconciliation can be imagined but what is mutual: For, did Man only fall out with God, and had not God just reason to be displeased with Men, for their *Apostacy* from him? If not, what made him so severely punish the Old World, for their *Impieties*, by a *Deluge*? what made him leave such *Monuments* of his Anger against the Sins of the World, in succeeding Ages, &c? Well then, supposing God to be averse from men by reason of their sins; shall this displeasure alwayes continue, or not? If it alwayes continues, men must certainly suffer the desert of their sin: If it doth not alwayes continue, then God may be said to be reconciled, in the same sense that an offended party is capable of being reconciled to him who hath provoked him. Now there are two wayes, whereby a party justly offended, may be said to be reconciled to him that hath offended him: First, when he is not onely willing to admit of Terms of Agreement, but doth declare his Acceptance of the Mediation of a third Person, and that he is so well satisfied with what he hath done in order to it, that he appoints it to be published to all the world, to assure
 the

the Offender, that if the Breach continues, the fault lies wholly upon himself: The Second is, when the Offender doth accept the Terms of the Agreement offer'd: And these two we assert, must necessarily be distinguished in the Reconciliation between God and us: For, upon the Death and Sufferings of Christ, God declares to the World, that he is so well satisfied with what Christ hath done and suffer'd, in order to the Reconciliation between himself and us, that now he publishes Remission of sins to the World, upon those Terms which the Mediator hath declared by his own Doctrine; but because Remission of sins doth not immediately follow upon the Death of Christ, without supposition of any act on our part, therefore the state of Favour doth commence from the performance of those Conditions that are required of us, &c. And now let the Authority of the Church of England interpose: Art. 31. [Of the one Oblation of Christ, finished upon the Cross:] The Offering of Christ once made, is that perfect Redemption, Propitiation and Satisfaction for the sins of the whole World, both Original and Actual, and there is none other Satisfaction for sin but that alone. But we shall be soundly pelted with the Fathers, and therefore he cites a great many more from Chrysostom, and from all concludes: That according to the sense of this Holy man, particular Christians are united to Christ by Means of their Union to the Christian Church; otherwise I cannot understand how our Union to Christ, can be an Argument to Union and Concord among our selves. But if that be the worst on't, that he cannot understand it, Charity commands me to believe his labouring understanding: It's a good Argument, that Children should entirely love one another,

another, because they are Children of the same Father; and yet for all that, they become not Children to their Father, by means of their Union one to another as Brethren; but they are therefore Brethren, because they are Children of the same Father. It's an Argument, that Subjects should study and follow the things that make for Peace among themselves, because they are all Subjects to the same Prince, and his honour, the strength, and security of his Kingdom, lyes much in it; and yet their Union among themselves is not the Means whereby they become related to their Prince; but because they are all Subjects to him, they become fellow-subjects each with other. And now methinks, a very ordinary pair of Brains might have understood, how our Union to Christ is an Argument to Christians to unite amongst themselves, though by their union amongst themselves they had not been united to Christ: And thus he might as well have quoted the Ancient Father *Alcmarin Gallo-Brigianus*, as either *Ambrose* or *Chrysostom*; but that we are all mightily concerned to know, that he reads the Fathers, to very little purpose.

But from hence he will give us a very reasonable word of Exhortation: *That they would seriously consider it, who boast of their Union to Christ, and yet rend his Church into a thousand little Factions*: I am glad however that they are not great Factions: And I would have them seriously consider it also, who broach such Doctrines, so contrary to the main design of the Gospel, that if owned by any Church, must necessitate an absolute and total separation, if we will be true to Christ. There have been many sad Controversies amongst us, but they have been about

about Mint, Anise, and Cummin, in comparison of the great and weighty things of the Gospel; but the Question now must be, Whether Christ be a true and proper High-priest, whether his death upon the Cross be a proper Sacrifice offer'd unto God, to reconcile him to sinners? The Question is now, Whether we must hold Communion with God in Prayer or no? Whether Faith and Repentance will unite us to Christ? Nay, whether there be any such thing as an Union with Christs Person or no? Nay, upon the Matter, whether there be a Person of Christ or no? or that all must not be interpreted into Doctrine, Church, Office, and I cannot tell what? Some I perceive are hugely afraid, least differences should be accommodated; they dread *The tombs of Controversies* almost as much as their Own; they are more solicitous how Quarrels may live, than about their own Deaths; and therefore fearing those smaller Bones of Contention would not set the World together by the ears long, they have thrown more considerable ones before us; to entail Contentions upon Posterity, and propagate Divisions to Eternity. It's the Interest of some men, to make loud clamours against Divisions, variety of Opinions, difference in Judgements, and yet to take special care that there shall never want matter for them; to complain of the Fire, and yet pour in Oyl to quench it; and if they may but warm their own hands, can sing over the flames which they have kindled, and do still foment. It has been the Policy of *Rome*, to build partition-walls of Separation, and then to rail at all that cannot leap over them; to thresh the Wheat out of the Floor, and then rage at it for Dividing from the Chaffe; to beat their Servants out of

of doo
all the
far o
be hig
The
Autho
rity is
us wi
Thuse
a plain
insist
Admi
we ma
There
Christ
This is
with;
dith o
stration
of our
such a
requisi
anted
in Chr
not qu
it is a
confess
venant
Chure
cellent
toward
his pr
baptiz

of doors, and then send Huy-and-cry after them, with all the Marks and Descriptions of Run-awayes. Thus far our Author has led us out of the way, and it will be high time to return.

The Fathers may now go to bed, and sleep; our Author will give them no further trouble: Authority is but an inartificial Argument, and now have at us with down-right Demonstration, and Club-law. *Those Sacraments our Saviour hath instituted, are a plain demonstration, that our Union with Christ consists in our union with the Christian Church.*

1. For Baptism. *Baptisme is the Sacrament of our Admission into the Visible Church; but in Baptisme we make a publick Profession of our Faith in Christ; Therefore the Union of particular Christians to Christ, is by Means of their Union with the Church. This is that plain Demonstration we are threatned with; and in a while, if our Author does but eat a dish of Beans and Bacon, it will be a plain Demonstration: In Baptism we make a visible Profession of our Faith in Christ; and if this Profession be true, such a one as the Church of England requires as prerequisite to Baptism, we are thereby United to Christ antecedently to our Baptism. If Baptism finds us not in Christ, it puts us not into Christ: If it finds us not qualified for a Church state, it makes us not so; it is a Symbol, but it supposes the thing signified; and confers it not: It is a Seal, but presupposes a Covenant: But that we are admitted into the visible Church by it, he will prove; and indeed he is excellent at proving what none deny; and very untoward at proving the thing in Question; but hear his proof; 1 Cor. 12. 13. *By one Spirit we are all baptized into one Body. In which* (says he) *the*
Apostle*

Apostle seems to allude to Baptism; which confers the same Holy Spirit on us All, and thereby makes us all Members of that one Body, which is his Church. I think he is resolved never to produce a pertinent Scripture, to prove the plainest Truth: For, 1. here is but an Allusion at most; and has he scolded all this while against Allusions, Allegories, and must he lay the main stress of his Argument upon an Allusion? 2. It but seems to Allude neither, and that weakens the Credit of it exceedingly: An Allusion, a seeming Allusion; A shadow, the dream of a shadow: Any thing or Nothing will serve his turn for plain demonstration; when a Mans Name is up for a demonstrative Man, he may lye in bed till noon. The Baptisme (says he) confers the same Holy Spirit upon us all: But the Apostle sayes no such matter, but the contrary; by the Spirit we are baptized; and not by Baptism receive the Spirit: Thus the Spirit Unites us to Christ; then comes Baptism, which looks backward as a Seal of what we have received, and forward to our visible state in the Church; and hence it appears, that our Union to Christ, is the Reason of our Union to the Church; and not our Union to the Church, the Means to unite us to Christ. 4. Baptism admits not into a particular Church, but the visible Church at large, and then it will be harder still for our Author to prove from thence, that the Union of particular Christians to Christ, is by Means of their union with a particular Church under the Bishops and Pastors: But if Allusions will not precurrent; Then (sayes he) more expressly in Eph. 4. 4, 5. There is one Body, and one Spirit, as you are called in one hope of your Calling, one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism: That is, the Christian Baptism

Baptism is but one; and is A Sacrament of Union; making us all the Members of that one Body of Christ; this is called being Baptized into Christ: i.e. Admitted into the Christian Church by a visible Profession of our Faith in Christ: Now for a small matter I could grant him all this, and yet despair of seeing his Conclusion: Baptism is but one; be it so: It's a Sacrament of Union; take it for granted: It makes us all Members of that one Body of Christ, which is his visible Church; let it be supposed: But still I wait for proof of this, That by Baptism we are all really united to Christ. But here are some things very pretty: 1. Baptism is but one, and is a Sacrament of Union: Very good; and so is the Spirit but one, and therefore he is the Means of Union. 2. By Baptism we are made Members of the one Body of Christ; that is, of the Visible Church: but is there no means to make us Members of the Invisible Church? 3. This is called, being Baptized into Christ. But is there no other way of uniting us to Christ, but by Baptism. 4. We are admitted into the Christian Church by a public Profession of our Faith in Christ: Very true; we are solemnly admitted into a Visible Station in the Visible Church, thereby alwayes supposing Repentance, whereby we forsake sin; and Faith, whereby we steadfastly believe the Promises of God made to us in that Sacrament, which has already united us to Christ.

2. The Lords Supper is a Sacrament of Union, and signifies that near Conjunction between Christ and Christians: Signifies it? It presupposes an Union both with Christ, and a particular Church: All are supposed, in one sence or other, to be in the

the Church, to be in Christ, that are admitted to it: Read over the Exhortation in the Liturgy at your best leisure. *My duty is, to exhort you to consider the Dignity of this Mystery. — And so to search and examine your Consciences, that you should come holy and clean, to a most Holy Feast: for otherwise, receiving of the Holy Communion doth nothing else but encrease your Damnation.* Again, in the other Exhortation: *For as the benefit is great, if with a true penitent heart, and lively Faith, we receive that holy Sacrament, (for Then we spiritually eat the flesh of Christ, and drink his blood, Then we dwell in Christ, and he in us,) so the danger is great, &c. and therefore, if any of you be a Blasphemer of God, N.B. an hinderer, or a slanderer of his Word, N.B. an Adulterer, or be in Malice, N.B. or Envy, or any other grievous crime, bewail your sins, and come not to this holy Table, lest the Devil enter into you, as he did into Judas.* But what can be more evident? our Author supposes we are united to the Church, united to Christ by Baptism; and therefore surely this other Sacrament confirms our Union, and does not first Create it.

I have long waited for an Argument to enforce his Conclusion, and now we shall have it: *The Intention of our Lord and Saviour in what he did and suffer'd for us, was not to reform and save some single Persons, but to erect a Church, and to combine all his Disciples into a publick Society.* A fairer Truth never dropt from his Pen, which some will like the better, because it is so handson and proper a Confutation of the whole Section: For, if this be Christs design to combine all his Disciples into a publick Society, then sure they were his Disciples,

related

related to him as their Lord and Master *before such combination*: Now to be a true Disciple of Christ, is no such slighty and trivial matter, that we may be such a one, and yet not united really to Christ: It implies Self-denyal, taking up the Cross, and following Christ; and that will go a great way to an Union with Christ; and yet of such as these it's granted, the Christian Society must be composed: But he copes up all this with a little Reason: *And therefore our Saviour does not own any Relation to particular men, as such, but as they are Members of his Body.* As such? Now for an Explication of the *Quæ*: *He owns no Relation to particular men as such; that is, as particular men*: No, I am very well satisfied of that; for then he should own a Relation to all particular men; for, *à quatenus ad omne valet consequentia*: But does he own a Relation to particular Believers, as Believers? will he own a Relation to a Disciple, as a Disciple? I am sure he has promis'd to own those, that own them as Disciples; and I am as sure, that if a particular Church be a combination of Disciples, he will own his Disciples wherever he finds them; so that I was just a concluding the clear contrary, if our Author had not given me timely Notice, That *because Christ does combine all his Disciples into publick Societies*, that therefore he does own, and is so related to, united with, and will have a special care of, his Disciples, as they are such: and he has evidenced his owning of them, and care for them; that he unites them into such Societies, wherein they may mutually discharge all Christian Offices to each other; edifie one another in Love, and be meet helps to one anothers Salvation. That Christ there-

fore owns a Relation to particular men, though not as men, but as holy men, is evident, *Heb. 2. 11.* Both he that sanctifieth, and they that are sanctified, are all of one; for which cause he is not ashamed to call them Brethren: Nor was he ashamed to own Paul to be a chosen Vessel to himself, upon his particular Conversion, nor to bestow the Holy Ghost upon him, and yet all this before Baptism, before his publick profession of the Christian Religion, and admission into the Visible Church.

At length we are assaulted with a kind of Argument from *1 John 1. 1, 2, 3.* *That which we have seen and heard, declare we unto you, that ye also may have fellowship with us, and truly our fellowship is with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ.* Here are so many sad misadventures in this one Argument, that I know not where to begin; and having begun, it will be as difficult to know where to make an end of pointing at them.

1. His Gloss is very Notable; *That which we have seen and heard:* That is, (says he) *The whole Doctrine, and History of the Gospel.* And thus we have gained one signification more of Christ, that we never heard of before: Christ is now not onely a Doctrine, a Church, an Office, but a History too, and ere long he will cut him short by an Apheresis, and make him a Story.

2. That his Gloss might pass without suspicion, he has concealed the Apostles words, *v. 1.* *That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, and seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled of the Word of Life:* This was certainly the same Person, of whom the same Apostle, *Joh. 1. 1.* affirms, *That he was in the begin-*

begin-
faw
wre
Bo
Lif
han
Hij
Sec
for
in v
was
But
3
even
it is
Me
abor
The
Chr
of o
Rela
wou
Petr
is a
ship
rion
not p
ther
latio
chise
ted,
4
will
any r

beginning with God; whom being made flesh, he saw, and looked upon with his eyes; whom he touched with his hands: the same Person who lay in the Bosom of the Father, and manifested that Eternal Life that was in the Father: And yet as he has handled the Matter, it shall be the handling of a History, the handling of a Doctrine. Really the Socinians are well-bred Gentlemen to our Author: for though they contend hotly about the Beginning, in which Christ is said to be, yet they confess it was the Person of Christ who was in the beginning. But,

3. Our Author has quite lost his Question; however it gave him the slip, I cannot tell, but gone it is to Jamaica: For the Question was about the Means of our Union to Christ? and the Answer is, about the Means of our Fellowship with Christ: The Enquiry was, Which way we are related to Christ? and he answers very gravely, to the Way of our enjoying the Privileges that flow from that Relation: Alas, if he had but once asked it, we would, for a word of his Mouth, have granted his Petition; That our Union with a particular Church, is a Means to let us into Communion and Fellowship with Jesus Christ; to admit us into many glorious Privileges, and happy advantages, which cannot possibly otherwise be obtained; only we would say, there must be a previous Union, an antecedent Relation to Christ, as the Foundation of our Enfranchisement in that Church, whereby we are enstated, and installed in all those Privileges.

4. The Communion we enjoy with the Church, will not prove that we are united to Christ thereby, any more than it will prove, that a Servant becomes

related to his Master by Means of his Relation to his Fellow-servants, because they eat, and drink, and work together; which is no tremendous Demonstration.

5. Those words, *That ye may have Fellowship with us*, are very ill glossed: That is, *become members of the Church of Christ*; for the Apostle writes unto them *as Members of the Christian Church actually*; otherwise the whole Epistle is unintelligible: chap. 2. 12. *I write unto you little Children, because your sins are forgiven you for his Names sake: I write unto you Fathers, because ye have known him that is from the beginning: I write unto you young men, because ye have overcome the wicked one.*

6. Those words, *That ye may have fellowship with us*, doe not denote, that the Fellowship of particular Believers must of necessity be with the Church immediately, and then with the Father and Christ, at the second hand; but that the Fellowship of the Apostle and all Believers, is joyntly and equally with the Father, and with Christ: His desire was, that others might enjoy the same Communion with both, that he enjoyed. And now the Reader will easily see the dreadfull Mischief of not stating the Question, and distinguishing its Terms at the first: It was obvious to every Man, (and I was aware of it) into what Confusions he would lead us, by the Ambiguity of *Church, Union, Means, Communion*; but I resolved he should run his Trundle, and when he had tyred himself in a Labyrinth of Errour, it would be a more seasonable time to talk with him.

His

His last Argument (which is therefore the best, because it is last) is taken from Excommunication.

Now, *This* (says he) *is a plain Demonstration: That our Union to Christ, is not an Union to his Person, but consists in the Spiritual communion with the Christian Church: Otherwise this External communion with the Church, could be no visible signification of our Union to Christ; nor could our Exclusion from the visible Church, signify our Separation from him.* This is another plain Demonstration, if you will take his word for it. Two things call for our Consideration: 1. What he would prove. 2. How he proves it.

(1) What he would prove: And I assure you, that is grown a great Secret of late: One while he would prove, *That our Union with a particular Church, was the means of our Union to Christ;* and within an hour after, he would prove: *That our Union with Christ, consists in our union with the Christian Church:* And now he will prove (or it shall cost him a fall) that *our Union to Christ, is not an Union to his Person.* And thus here's another Hare risen up before us, which whilst we pursue, it's ten to one we shall lose them all. If I might counsel our Author, before I would be Tormented with a Fugitive, Vagabond, Protean Question, that's never two Hours in one mind, nor ever tarries two Hours in one place, I would clap it in Irons, and Chain it to a Post. For if the Reader will give me Credit in so small a Matter, I verily thought for some while, that he had been Hammering out a Proof; That *our Union to Christ, is by means of our union to the Church.* At last, I perceived another Conclusion just Peep out of the shell; That *our Union to Christ, consists in our union with the Church:* And all along,

I Dream't, that, *that Christ* about whom the Question was; He that was the *Shepherd*, to whom the *Sheep* are *United*; the *Husband*, to whom the *Spouse* is *United*; the *King of the Church*, to whom all *Christians* are *United*; had been a *real*, and *very Person*, and that it had been supposed that *Christians* are some way or other, *United* to him; Only all the Question was, Whether they were so *United* by *Means* of the *Church*, or no? For if we are *not united* to *Christ* at all, it's a needless Enquiry, *How*, or by *what means* we are *United* to him? Or, *wherein* that *Union* consists? For this takes away the *Subject of the Question*: What is it then, *wherein* this *Union* with *Christ* consists? Why, *It consists in a sincere and Spiritual communion with the Christian Church*. And now the Question must be Trimed over again: *Whether our Union with the Church, consists in a sincere communion with the Church?* That is, *this Face of the Question* will do best in *this place*; for I always observe, our Author Writes just from *Hand to Mouth*; and if he can but make a *Rubbing Shift* for the *present Page*, let the *next* take care for it self.

(2) And now let us hear his plain Demonstration. Otherwise (says he) *this External communion with the Church, could be no visible signification of our Union to Christ*. A notable Argument (no doubt) if any Living-body understood it. In the words fore-going, he tells us: He means by *Union with Christ*, a *sincere and Spiritual communion with the Church*: And then the old question would have stood thus: *Whether our union with a particular Church, be the means of our sincere and spiritual communion with the Church*: And if he had thus *spoke out*, I am assured he had met with no *Opposition*: But he intend-

ed another thing then, and entertain'd new Counsels upon new Successes, and greater hopes from achieved Victories. But still the Reader is Importunate for the Demonstration: Then take it, and make your best on't: *External communion with the Church, is a visible signification of our Union to the Church; (that he means by Christ) and therefore our Union to Christ, consists in a sincere and Spiritual communion with the Christian Church.* And if he had told us plainly, that there is no such thing as *Union with Christ*; but that the Phrase of *Union with Christ* is an empty Name, and has no more in it, than *union with a Church*; it had been easie to have understood the strength of his Will, and the weaknesses of his Reason, without half this Circumlocution.

[3.] His next Observation is; *That the Union between Christ, and the Christian Church, is not a Natural, but a Political Union: That is* (says he) *such an union as is between a Prince and his Subjects.* It was but just now, that he told us, *That our Union with Christ, is not an union with his Person*; and yet now he will explain the Nature of this Union, between Christ and the Church. And indeed, he has so Bewildred himself, that it needs a great deal of Explication, and I doubt, all will be too little to deliver it from Non-sence: For his Explication must be this: "The Union between the Church and the Christian Church, is not a Natural, but a Political Union; such an union as is between a Prince and his Subjects. Now this has two Faults in it: First, That if it were true, it would Over-turn his whole Design; which I can be very well content withall. And, Secondly, (which is the Misery on't) its False, and there-

fore will neither Overthrow, nor Support his Design: And therefore his Interest will lie in this one thing, (if he could but see it) to Prove his Assertion to be False, that there may be *some hopes left* of his conclusion.

(1.) As it stands, it apparently Overthrows his whole Design. For if this Politick Union be such a one as is between a Prince, and his Subjects: Then, 1. There is such a thing alive again in the World, as Union with, and Relation to Christs Person: For surely, Subjects are Related to, and united with the Person of their Prince. 2. Then *this Union to Christ*, denotes *Primarily* a Relation to, and Union with the *Person of Christ*; and only *Secondarily*, an Union with, and Relation to his *Laws and Commands*, and the rest of our fellow Subjects. For I think, the Reason why Subjects give Obedience to any Laws, is, because they are the Laws of him who is the Legislator: The Reason why the Sheep are subject to Pastoral Orders, is, because they are the Orders, and Instituted by him who is their Shepherd, and has a right to Enjoyn them: And the Reason why the Wife subjects her self to the Commands of her Husband, is, because she is united to him, upon those Terms in the Marriage-covenant. All Duty is founded in Relation; It's impossible to conceive Conjugal Duty, without a Preconception of Conjugal Relation: If therefore such be our Relation to Christ; such our union to Him; as of Sheep to Shepherd, Wife to Husband, Subjects to a Prince; then are we first Related to his Person, and as far as such Relation will Unite, united to his Person; and then his Negative is blown up:

That

That our Union to Christ is not an union to his Person, but consists in our communion with his Church. Which is, as if he should say, Our Relation to our Prince, is no Relation to his Person; but consists in our Union to the Common-wealth; which is a neat Engine to hook in Democracy.

But (2) It's False, which is the worst on't; *our union to Christ* is not fully explain'd by a *Political union*. It's true, *It is not a Natural union*; but yet it's well *Explain'd* by, and bears a full Analogy with a *Natural union*: The Relation is not Natural, but Spiritual; and yet it has pleased the Holy Ghost to express the *Spiritual Relation*, by the *Natural*. The Relation between a Prince and his Subjects, expresses something of that Relation that is between Christ and Believers; but not the whole: All the Similitudes used in Scripture, to Illustrate the Relation between Christ and Christians, have something in common with each other. All imply *absolute Sovereignty, and Authority*, tempered with *tenderness of Affection* on Christs part; and all imply an *absolute Subjection* to be given to Him, with *delights and complacency* on our parts; yet some of them express a *nearer union*, and more *endeared Affections* than others: That of a Master, Lord, and King, expresses Authority; and Power, yet not that *Intimacy, and union*, which is expressed by that of *Husband, and Wife*: That of a King, implies Christ to be a *Head of Government*; but that of the *Head in the Natural Body*, implies the Communications of Grace, of Strength, Counsel, and Power to Obey; and withal, that there's such an Intimate union between Christ and true Believers, that the Members in the Natural are

no

not more (though in another way) united to the Head, and one to another, than Christ and Christians are in this, which may be called a *Mystical union*; for Christ and Believers are hereupon called, *One Christ*, 1 Cor. 12. 12. *As the Body is one, and hath many Members, even so is Christ*: That is, so is the Lord Christ and his Church. When therefore (he says) "That Christ is called a Head, and the Church his Body; a Husband, and the Church his Spouse; which two Metaphors signify the same thing, and are both of them Names of Power and Authority: It is something of the Truth, but not the whole Truth, nor nothing else but the Truth. *Something of truth* there is in it: *Christ's Headship*, denotes *Authority*: But then it's not the *entire Truth*: *Christ's Headship* denotes *more than bare Authority*: And then there's something more than the Truth: Those two Metaphors *do not* denote the *same thing*: That of the Husband over the Wife, denotes Power mixed, and sweetly tempered with Love, and Pity: But that of the *Head over the Members*, denotes a continual Influx of all saving Grace into his Members. I wish therefore, he would leave Trifling with his Hackney Fallacy; That because *Christ is a Head of Authority*, He is not an *Head of Influence*: For he that can assert, that the *Union and Relation between Christ and Christians*, has no *Spiritual correspondency with a Natural Union*; (which yet is Explicated by it) may when he sees his own time, deny, That the Union between Christ and Christians, has any Analogy with a *Political union*, though he has (*Pro hac vice*) Explicated the Union by it.

There is one thing more, wherein our Author shows

shows himself a great Divine, and a mighty Statesman; for the *very sound of Political Union*, is enough to Inspire a Man that is prepared for such Impulses. "Our Union to Christ (*says he*) consists in our Belief of his Revelations; Obedience to his Laws, and Subjection to his Authority: As Obedience to our Prince, is the strongest Bond of a Political Union, which is Dissolved and Broken by Rebellion and Disobedience. But this is neither truly Asserted, nor wisely Explained. 1. Not truly asserted: For our Union to Christ, does not consist in that Obedience, which we give him as our Lord, our Shepherd, our Husband; but in that Act of Obedience whereby at first we take him for our Lord, Shepherd, and Husband; and give up our selves sincerely to him again, to be his Sheep, Subjects, Spouse. 2. Nor wisely Explicated: For if Relation to a Prince, does formally consist in Obedience, and that Union be dissolved by Rebellion; then whenever a Rebel shakes hands with Actual Subjection, he absolves himself from the duty to Obey, which would save the horrible Charges of the Popes Bull. Our Author has acquainted the World with a very fine way, how to live a Traitor. Twenty years, and yet never commit but one single sin at first, but all the *after* acts will be Regular: For if Rebellion dissolve, and break in pieces the Union between Prince and Subject, then he ceases any longer to be a Subject; and by consequence whatever sins he commits, must be called by other Names, for it can be no Rebellion: When the Relation ceases, Duty ceases; Obedience is a *conserving cause of Union*, but the Union lies not in it: He that does not perform his Duty, yet is under

(322)
der an Obligation to perform his Duty; the Union continues, though many acts unsuitable to the Union are committed. But should we be so charitable as to grant him all this, he will be weary on't in a while; as little Children, that make a heavy and piteous moan for a Gewgaw, and when they have it, throw it away.

Thus after all his *Rodomontade*, That this Union is a *Political union*, such as is *between Prince, and Subjects*; as if his Book could never have been *Licensed*, if he had talk'd of any thing below Crowns and Diadems, and the *Roman Empire*: Yet pag. 162. he tells us, That God has laid aside, in a great Measure, that severe Name of a King, and calls himself our Father, to signify that Liberty we enjoy under the Gospel, in Opposition to the Bondage, and Servitude of the Law of Moses. Well, whatever opinion he has of Monarchy, the severity of it's Name, the Bondage and Servitude that it brings Men under; I know many, who if they might choose, had rather come under that severe Name of King, as to their Religious concerns, than feel the more smooth, and Debonair Treatment, of some Spiritual Fathers.

It's very Tiresome to Travel out of the way; for the further we go on, the further we have to come back; and yet thus has our Author seduced his Reader, but now we shall come to a vein of Matter; for having reduced all the benefit Believers have from Christ as their Head, to *Political Government*, there is but one thing more, which if he can cleverly compass, the day is his own; and this is to strip Christ of that little Power and Authority he had left him: To this end we must observe further:

"That

That though Christ be our Lord and Governour,
 "he does not Govern us immediately by Himself,
 "for he is Ascended into Heaven, where he power-
 "fully Intercedes for his Church, and by a Vigi-
 "lent Providence, superintends the affairs of it;
 "but he has left the Visible and External conduct
 "and Government of it, to Bishops and Pastors,
 "who preside in his Name, and by his Authority.
 To which I answer:

1. That Christs committing *the External conduct* of his Churches to his own Officers, may very well consist with his own *Internal and Invisible conduct* of his Peoples Souls, and their Spiritual concerns.

2. Whatever Authority Christ has *vested his Officers* with, he has *Devested himself* of none, he continues sole Head of the Church still; *All Power is committed to him in Heaven, and in Earth*: And though there are some that would ease him of the Trouble, yet I have not heard that he has laid down *his Commission*, nor taken any into *joynt Commission* with himself.

3. Christ has given *an Authority* in the Churches to all *his own Officers*, but he has not given to any of them *his Authority*: And indeed, unless he could Communicate to them *his Power*, as well as *his Authority*, it would signifie little. But, I hope, they know their places better than so; they are Servants of Jesus Christ, tied up to their Instructions, as all Ambassadors are, though they come *in the Name* of their Prince; and their Commission runs, to *teach us to Observe whatsoever Christ has Commanded in the Scripture*.

4. As to the *External Conduct* of the Church,
 Christ

Christ has left it as much to Princes, as to Bishops, and more; for several Reasons that I know of, but one is this: That every *Supreme Magistracy* is next and immediately under Christ; *Supreme Head and Governour of the Church*, within his own Dominions. Well, but what Reason does he favour us with? Why Christ doth not immediately Govern us Himself.

1. *He is ascended into Heaven*: Well: Yet he knows how to be present with all and every one of his, to the end of the World! And, *Where two or three meet together in his Name, he will be in the midst of them*: He has sent *Vicarium vni Spiritum sancti*, who does Manage for him a *Spiritual Government* in the Souls of all the *Elect*: And since I have named two such dangerous words, as *Sanctification*, and *Election*, I had best bethink my self of good Security; and that I have from the Church Catechism. Quest. *What dost thou learn chiefly in these Articles of thy Belief?* *Ans.* — “I learn to believe in God the Holy Ghost, who Sanctifieth me, and all the Elect People of God.

2. *He powerfully Intercedes for his Church*. Why sure *Intercession* with the Father, is not inconsistent with *immediate Rule and Government* over his Saints. But,

3. *By his vigilant Providence, he Superintends all the Affairs of it*: Why then he Governs it: Nay, Soft a-while: He will allow Christ a *Transmarine Superintendency*, but no proper *Episcopal Jurisdiction*: That is, he may be a *Spectator*, or a *By-stander*; and look on to see how Squares go, but must not meddle with the *Immediate Government* of us; for he has put that out of his Hands, and

left

left it
is the
years
he)
ticula
Christ
but g
fixati
Hume
other
proba
the S
As th
soma
ever
Name
search
it c
Obey
prete
wem
ranto
An
state
“to
“Lo
“lov
“can
“to
form
of th
and v
our f
and

left it to the Bishops and Pastors: Which I confess, is the worst News that I have heard this Seven years. But now for the Conclusion: *This is* (says he) *a plain Demonstration, That the Union of particular Christians to Christ, is by union with the Christian Church.* Shortly, If our Author does but give a grave Nod, it will amount to a *Demonstration*; but if he should please to give a *Lusty Ham*, it will be a *plain Demonstration*: Though others are so perverse, they will not own it for a *probable Conjecture*; for the Spiritual subjection of the Soul and Conscience, is immediately to Christ: As the Emperour once said, *Non tibi sed Petro*; so may every Christian, *Non tibi sed Christo*. Whatever Command the Officers of Christ bring us in his Name, their Commission is Patent, and we must search the Scriptures to see whether it be so or no; if it carries the Signature of Christs Authority, we Obey him in hearing them; and if they have, or pretend to have any private Instructions, or *Cabala*, we may fairly demur to them, or bring a *Quo Warranto* against them.

And now at last, he will leave his Imperious Dictates, and come to Disputation: "If our Union to Christ, consist in our Subjection to him as our Lord and Master, Head and Husband, it follows that we cannot be United to Christ, (*that is, cannot own his Authority*) till we Unite our selves to the publick Societies of Christians. But the former is true. *Ergo, &c.* To the Consequence of the former Proposition, all I say, is, It's feeble and very Sick. Our union to Christ may consist in our subjection to him as King, Lord, and Husband, and yet we may be united to him thus, before our

Actual

Actual union to a particular Society. Well, he will prove it thus: *This Authority of Christ is not Exercised immediately by Himself, but by the Bishops, and Pastors of the Church.* To which I return:

1. If he means that only *Christ exercises not a Visible Authority by himself*, but by the Guides and Pastors of the Church, it may be true; but then it will prove no more than this. That we are *visible Professors of Christs Name*, by our *Uniting to a particular Church*, under the Guides and Officers thereof, which is not the thing in Question.

2. If he means that *Christ exercises not any inward Authority over the Soul, immediately by Himself*; I must return to my former Answer, which is a peremptory denial.

3. Whether this Authority be exercised immediately by Christ, or not? Our *Union with Christ* may be immediate: For our acceptance of Christ as Lord, King, and Husband, is *the Bond of our Union*, and the Exercise of all Authority of a Superior in those Relations, must still of necessity presuppose the Union, and Relation. But as to our Antecedent: *That our Union to Christ, consists in our Subjection to him as our Lord, Head, and Husband*: Which is very true, of that *Act of Subjection* whereby at first we accept of him to be all these to us, and give up our selves to be all the other to him; but very false of those *Subsequent Acts of Obedience* which flow from, but do not *Constitute* the Relation: And therefore it was prudently done, to Explain *Union to Christ*, by owning his *Authority*. For however it be false, yet every one will not spie that, who Rides on a Trotting Horse; and

it

it will serve to make a Semblance of saying something. It's true, we cannot own *Christ's Authority*, if we *Derogate from his Commands*; but yet our union with Christ, and our relation to him, must precede our owning his Authority over us. And for this, our Author has fitted us with a Similitude, which may befriend Us as well as it's owner. *No man can be said to submit himself to his Prince, who denies Subjection to Subordinate Magistrates, who Act by his Commission: For the union of Bodies Politick, consists in Order and Government, when all the Members keep their proper places, and are knyt together by a faithful Discharge of their Duties.* I could not hope for more Weakness in an Adversary, than I shall be sure to find in this Similitude.

First, *None can be said to submit to his Prince, who denies Subjection to Subordinate Magistrates:* And thus none can be said to submit himself to Christ, who denies Obedience to his Officers, who act in his Name.

Secondly, As Submission to Subordinate Magistrates, is not that wherein our Relation to our Prince consists, but an effect of it; so a due subjection to our spiritual Guides, is not that wherein our Union to Christ consists, but a Consequent of it: We first owe a subjection to Christ, and from thence to them who Command us in his Name. Thus the Apostle; *2 Cor. 8. 5. They first gave themselves to the Lord, and to us, by the Will of God.*

Thirdly, *No man can be said to Submit, who Rebels.* (A weighty truth:) But he may be said to owe submission, though he rebels: His Prince has

D d

not

not lost his right to Command, though he (like a Villain) wants Grace to Obey.

Fourthly, It's very Childish, and spoken like a Green-headed Statesman, That the union of Bodies Politick, consists in Order and Government. For, Order and Government, are for the preservation of the Union, and not the first union of these Bodies Politick. The union of Prince and People, consists in their first relation to one another as such; and the exercise of Government, is to secure that union, and the advantages of it: If union consists in Order and Government, then Disorder and ill Government would dissolve the union, and relation, and by consequence discharge all Subjects from a Conscience of their Duty; which is very dangerous Doctrine, and a wide Gap to all Rebellion: What a pitiful plight were Princes in, if the Foundations of Government, the Essential reasons of the Peoples subjection, were to be Discanted upon by every Churchman. The Childs relation to his Father, does not consist in his filial Obedience, but is the reason of it: The Subjects relation to his Prince, does not consist in Subjection, but is the true Ground of it: The Wife, her relation to her Husband, does not consist in her submission to her Husband, but is the Spring of it: A disobedient Child is a Child still, he cannot shake off the relation; a rebellious person, though he deserves not the honourable Title of a Subject, yet he is a Subject, and cannot put off that relation: An untoward Wife, is a Wife still; and every act, nay, many acts of Disobedience cannot dissolve the Copula: For otherwise, the way to be rid of a relation, would be to Violate the

the Duties of it; and then all future Disobedience would be no sin: Breaule, when the union is once Null, and the relation dissolved, there's no Foundation upon which the Superiour can build a claim to Duty; and this would be a short Cut, and save abundance of time and Charges, in suing out a Divorce: For, let but the Wife disobey, and the union which consists in Obedience, Vanishes.

A little Divertisment will now be seasonable, both for our Author and his Readers; and therefore he will give us a plain Account of the only cause that can justify Separation. In the mean time it seems, there is a Cause, though but one only Cause that will justify it; and separation will not always argue Schism: And now all you that would know the one, the only one Cause in all the World, that can justify a Separation from a true Church, draw near and give your attention.

1. *When any Church prevaricates in the Laws of Christ.* Prevaricates? How many thousands of Schismaticks will shrowd themselves under the Covert of that one Word? He has opened a Gate, at which three Coachful of Separatists, may Drive all-a-Brest. If then a Church shall pretend to give us the Laws of Christ in *Scriptis*, (such was the Knavery of a Cardinal in the Consistory, before the Conventicle of *Trent*) and yet by Preaching and Practice, destroy those very Laws, or the Ends of them; if the Church of *Rome* shall talk Big words of *Holy Mother Church*, and yet embrace in her arms as her Children, the vilest Varlets, and shut out none but the Good, unless now and then an old Fornicator, or some such like Vermin, that want Money

to Buy off, or Commute for Penance; this is an unworthy Prevarication, and if it shall certainly appear, will justify a separation.

2. *When it corrupts Religion* : And this will go a great way (I promise you) in some particular Churches. Corruption may be by Addition, Subtraction, Multiplication, or Division : The end of the Keys may be perverted, those shut out whom Christ would receive : and they admitted whom Christ would exclude : It may strike with the back of the spiritual Sword when it should use the edge, and wound with the edge when it should sleep in the Scabbard ; Christs Religion may be corrupted by mingling our own inventions, with this pure and plain institutions : and then we have a cause, or a piece of a cause that paves our way for separation, as broad as that by which Israel departed out of Egypt, חמשה five in a rank.

3. *When it undermines the fundamental design of Religion which is to make men good, and vertuous.* So that though they do not openly assault it by battery, and escalado, yet if they shall secretly undermine Godliness, by denying the office of the holy spirit in Creating men to good, and vertuous works, and teach men to trust to their own natural strength, and shall craftily oppose the Doctrine of the Scriptures and the Church of England : That the condition of man after the fall is such, that he cannot turn by his own natural strength, without the Grace of God preventing him, that he may have a good will : or if they shall disown the satisfaction of Christs death upon the cross to Gods holiness, and his justice founded thereon, which is the bottom of our return to God
and

and of our holy walking with him; why then farewell as far as the shoes of the Gospel will carry you.

4. *When we cannot obey our spiritual rulers without disobeying the Laws of Christ: when Christs commands, and they forbid; when he forbids, and they command; then we have our passport to be gone, and travel to the utmost ends of the Earth: These are those four things, all in one that will justify a separation from a particular society, and if our Authour would preach this Doctrine to his Parishoners, he might leave it to them to make the Application.*

But now on the other side, *if the Church we live in acknowledges the Authority, and submits to the Laws of Christ, we are bound to live in Communion with it.* Very true, but not true for our Authors Reason, *because this Unites us to Christ, which is το εσχατον*, but go on! *when nothing is made the condition of our Communion, which is expressly forbidden by the Laws of the Supreme Lord, we acknowledge his Authority in our subjection to our spiritual guides.* Now here are many things might be opposed.

1. *Let it be considered whether an implicate prohibition from the Supreme Lord be not sufficient to make a condition of Communion unlawful? and I cannot but wonder that our Authour in this case is all for an expresse prohibition, when perhaps that may signify a Command if he follows but his own rule, not to interpret phrases by the sound of words.* But,

2. *In submitting to such conditions of Communion as are not expressly forbidden, the Question is, whether*

ther herein we submit to Christs authority? and this I confesse I stick at: And the Reason of my doubtful hesitation is this. Because it supposes an *acknowledgment of Christs Authority*, where he has not interposed his Authority: supposes him to speak, where he is silent, and to Command obedience where he commands nothing; nay where he has *forbidden*, though not *expressly forbidden* that condition. Now as I am not bound to obey an *inferiour Magistrate*, unless his particular command be warranted by his *Commission*, though it be not *forbidden* in his *Commission*; so it seems I am not bound to Obey a *particular Church*, in a particular imposed condition, if not authorized by Christs instructions, though it be not *forbidden* there, at least no such refusal of obedience can be interpreted to be a *disowning of Christs Authority*, because he is supposed to have determined neither *Pro nor Con*. If we turn back to p. 164. Our Authour has these words: *No man can be said to submit himself to his prince, who denies subjection to those subordinate Magistrates who act by his Commission*: so no man can be said to resist his Prince who gives subjection to all inferiour officers in all things wherein they act by his *Commission*; for he may passe for a very tolerable good Subject who does all things that are commanded him, so in this case; no man can be said to Obey Christ who denies subjection to the Pastors of the Church who act according to their instructions from the supreme Lord of the Church: nor any be said to resist Christs authority, though they refuse compliance in those things to the Officers of the Church, wherein they act besides their *Commission*. But let

us a
law
of
deat
mak
be f
Chr
agai
Chr
with
the
Bar
com
Chu
we
to C
ther
fere
cess
to
mal
thin
Na
ple
at
the
fou
sou
bal
wh
the
sto
the

us a while wholly set aside the consideration of the lawfulness or unlawfulness of these new conditions of Communion: yet still me thinks there's a great deal of *dissimulacy* in the Pastors of a Church, to make new *Terms of Communion* with them, for if it be so necessary as is pretended, to our Union with Christ, that we be United to the Church: and then again so necessary to our Salvation to be United to Christ: and then further so necessary to our Union with the Church, to submit to those conditions that the Pastors shall appoint, every new condition is a Bar to, and a Clog upon our Salvation. We must come up to the condition e're we can be United to the Church, and we must be United to the Church, e're we can be United to Christ, and we must be United to Christ, e're we can be saved: That condition therefore how small soever it be in it self, how indifferent soever in its own Nature is thereby made necessary to Salvation, because indispensably required to that which is so: Now I will not clamour, and make a noise at this as an evil thing, but yet me thinks it does not look as if it had over much good Nature in't, for a Church to deal thus with the people. The Church received a Religion from Christ at first, that had no incumbrance upon it, and that the Church should leave it deeper engaged than she found it, I think is not very handsome: if the Church found the door wide open; why does shee set it on half-charrs: when shee could march in with a full body, why should others be forced to crowd in and wedge themselves through a narrow wicket sidelings? why should the Pastors lidd heavy burdens on others shoulders, when Christ laid none upon theirs? or

why should they raise the Markets so high in the latter age, when they had it so cheap in the primitive times? It was a good plain saying of King James to the pragmatical *Spalatensis*, when he would be new modelling affairs at *Winfor*. *Extranemus! Relinqueres sicut eas invenisti*. Come Reader, there's no false Latine in't, had former Ages heard and taken the advice, we could have been content with the *Primitive light*, though we had wanted *sumptuous Candlesticks*; the power of Religion, had made amends for its plainnesse; and golden Officers, recompensed wooden chalices: Thus far at our Authors invitation we have step't out of the way, and are now ready to return with him into it.

The next thing considerable wherein he engages, is a description of the *New nature*, whereof the Holy Ghost makes frequent mention, as that from which all new Obedience must proceed.

This New Nature, (says he) *the Scripture represents under several Notions*.

1. *By the subjection of our minds and Spirits to Christ*.

2. *By a participation of the same Nature, which is the necessary effect of the subjection of our minds to him*.

If a man would study to be cross all his days, and resolve to trade in no figure but *Hysteron Proteron*, he might hardly hope to equalize our Author in this discourse. For,

1. *What subjection of mind, and Spirit, can be given to Christ, without a new Nature, from whence that Act of subjection should proceed?* the most inward Acts of Obedience are yet but Acts: the most

most *spiritual and refined workings* of the soul are still *but works*, and have alwayes for their root and principal, a good and an honest; a new, and a renewed heart and Nature. Thus we see 'tis in Nature: there must be a *principle* of motion, before there can be *natural motion*, all the rest is *violent*, and against the hair. And this order our Saviour has described in the most plain, and familiar way to gratifie our understandings that they could desire. *Math. 12. 33. Either make the tree good and the fruit good; or the evil and the fruit evil, and Math. 7. 17. 18. Do men gather Grapes of thornes, or Figs of Thistles. Even so every good Tree bringeth forth good Fruit, and a corrupt Tree brings forth evil fruit:* But our Authour has found out a way called Transmutation of species: to make a *Thorn* become a *Vine*, and to Transubstantiate a *Thistle* into a *Fig-tree*: I know the Reader has a grudging of the old curiosity to see the experiment: The operation therefore is this, teach a Thistle to produce Figs for one seven years, and you shall see it become as very a Fig-tree as any is in the world, thus let the natural and unregenerate man perform multiplied Acts of the best obedience he can, and without any efficacious working of the Holy Ghost he shal acquire a new heart, which I shall believe at the same time, when I see a thousand Cyphers give themselves the significancy of one figure. Our Blessed Saviour has long ago determined this to our hand. *John 3. 6. That which is born of the flesh is flesh.* Let the *Egyptian* Pollinfectors practise upon it, let them sweeten perfume, and season it with the spicery of *India*, and all the balm of *Gilead*, it will be but flesh still, all its operations carnal.

2. It

2. It will be of good use in this matter to enquire, wherein lay the Image of God in *Adam*, what relation it had to his obedience, and thence perhaps we may get some light what order the Image of God in us observes: That it mainly consists in righteousness and true holiness, no man can doubt that reads the Apostles description, *Eph. 4. 24.* but now it is evident that *Adam* did not procure this Image of God, by repeated Acts of obedience, it was not the result of many particular duties, it was no acquired habit, but it was concreated with him, as a condition due and meet for a Creature made to such sublime, and glorious ends as the enjoyment of his God, and from this Nature, this Image of God, proceeded all that Obedience which he payed, all that which God required, and accepted. And if this be so, it's evident that all who are renewed, who are born again, who are Created unto good works go through the same method. So the Apostle *Col. 3. 10.* *And have put on the new man which is renewed in knowledge after the Image of him, that Created him:* The order of Gods working is conformable to his promise, we may be sure he will do both what, and how he has promised, *Ezek. 36. 26.* *A new heart also will I give you, and a new Spirit will I put within you, And I will take away the stony heart out of your Flesh, and give you an heart of Flesh; and I will put my Spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my Statutes, and ye shall keep my judgments, and do them:* where the order and method of God in this great work is laid down, with such a convincing evidence that he must have no eyes or shut those he has who does not see it. And,

I. God

1. God promises that he will remove the great Principle of resistance, that which makes head, and opposition to the Commands of God: *the stony, hard, inflexible Heart*.

2. That he will bestow another; a better, a new heart, a soft Spirit, a heart of Flesh: that may comply and close in with Gods Commands.

3. That from this new heart, all new obedience, all service acceptable to God must proceed as from its spring or root. *I will put my Spirit into you, and cause you to walk in my Statutes, and ye shall keep my judgments.*

4. That all obedience, inward and outward obedience: keeping the Commandments of God with the heart, and doing them in the practice of our lives, yet all must proceed from this new heart, this new Spirit, which God promised, to put within them.

But he comes to close Argument, we are exhorted that the same mind be in us that was in Christ, Phil. 2: 5. And to be his disciples is to learn of him, who was meek, and lowly in Spirit, Math. 11: 29. We question not that, its our duty to imitate Christ; to copy out all his imitable excellencies; and if he can prove that we can do this, viz. imitate Christ in Acts of self denial, taking up the Crosse, bearing reproach, forgiving enemies, without a better heart, and Nature, than we brought into the world with us, he will then begin to speak to the purpose: But (says our Author) Christ transcribed his own nature into his Laws; and therefore a sincere obedience to his Laws is a conformity to his Nature. To which I answer,

1. He that transcribed his Nature into his own Laws,

Laws, must yet *transcribe it once more*, even into the hearts of a son of Adam, ere he can give to him *that new Obedience* which is acceptable to him; It was not enough that God wrote his Lawes in Stone, unless they be written upon the Tables of the heart with the finger of God.

2. Obedience to the Lawes of Christ does *increase our conformity* to the Nature of Christ, but still there must be a renewed heart and Nature, upon which all progressive conformity to Christ in obedience must proceed.

3. Transcribing of Christs Nature into his Lawes is a Metaphorical expression, which our Authour may explain how he pleases, but I observe alwayes, when he can cloath an Argument with Metaphors, he is then secure: yet still he presses upon us from, Rom. 8. 9. *If any man have not the Spirit of Christ he is none of his.* That is (says he) *Unless he have the same Temper, and disposition of mind that Christ had*: Now let the Reader look well about him, and he shall see rare sights: we do all remember that to be *United to Christ*, or to be *one of Christs*, signifie to be *United to a particular Church*: And now we are told: That by *having the Spirit of Christ*, is meant *being of the same temper and disposition*: and now from hence we have these consequences.

1. That if any man be not of *the same Temper with Christ*, that is be not holy, as he is holy: he cannot be United to a particular Church: And our Saviour has vouched for it, John 3. 5. *Except a man be regenerate and born again he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God.* We must be like minded

with

with Christ, and thereby become one of his : and what is now become of the great Proposition that has filled so many pages. That the only means of Uniting as to Christ is by our Union with a particular Church.

2. He tells us that Union to Christ is described by having the Spirit : and then having the Spirit is interpreted by being of the same Temper with Christ : so now we have got another Doctrine : That our Union to Christ consists in being of the same Temper, and disposition with him. But,

3. We have here an excellent expedient to discharge the World both of the Person of Christ, and of the Spirit too : For as he can interpret Christs Person into Doctrine, office Church, Religion, Bishops, Baptism ; so he has interpreted the Spirit into Temper, disposition ; and when an exigency calls for it, he may explicate it by a strong wind, or a vapour, and then his work is done. But,

4. For the explicating of the new Nature, he tells us there is a closer Union which results from this, which consists in a mutual, and reciprocal love, which I am glad of, amongst other Reasons for this ; that now it will be lawfull to Love Christ, without persecution, provided alwayes we do not over love him, nor be passionately in love with him : but yet there are a few inconveniences which attend this explication. For,

1. If we be United, and closely United to Christ by Love, then a Political Union, is not the onely one betwixt Christ and Christians.

And,

2. Then

2. Then it seems (for all the sorrow) a Christian may be United to Christ without being United to a particular Church: for we therefore love Christians because we love Christ, and are taken with the imperfect holiness which is copied out into their Natures, and lives, because we are surprized first with a delightful admiration of Him who is the grand exemplar of all perfect Holiness, 1 John 5. 1. *He that loveth him that begat, loveth him also that is begotten of him.* 3. Why may not this Union with Christ signifie an Union with the Church as well as the other? and then to love Christ signifies no more than to love his Church, and so we are but where we were.

4. Its very strange, that our Love should result from our obedience, and subjection, whereas its hard to conceive how the soul should give subjection without Love, and if it should give any, a forced subjection without its principle of Love, would find as cold a well-come in Christs heart, as that cold heart it came from: our Saviour had described obedience as the result of love. John 14. 15. *If ye Love me keep my Commandments.* No (says our Authour) keep my Commandments, and then you will fall in Love with me: but let him give light to his own Notions: when we are transformed into the Image of Christ, he loves Us as being like him; and we love him too, as partaking of his Nature. He loves us, as the price of his blood, in his own workmanship created to good works, and we love him, as our Saviour, and Redeemer.

er, now love is the great Cement of Union which unites interest, and thereby does more firmly unite hearts. It is not then quite so bad as was pretended; to Love the Lord Jesus Christ; provided we have but our Authours license to love him: but now the Question will be this: whether our Union to Christ consists in a mutual and reciprocal love? And if our Authour had been judge a little while since, he would have resolved it in the Negative, That our Union to Christ consists in our Union to a particular Church: and that it is a political union, such a one as is between Prince, and Subject, and consists in a belief of his revelation, obedience to his Laws, and subjection to his Authority. I shall only note a few things, and dismiss it.

1. That there is a love of Benevolence and good Will, a designing, purposing love in Christ towards us, before we bear his Image and Superscription: this love he bears towards those that are unlike him, Rom. 5. 8. God Commendeth his love to us, that when we were yet sinners Christ dyed for us: verse 10. When we were enemies we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son.

2. There must of necessity be the intervention of an Union, a likeness, a Conformity of Natures, before there can be supposed a love of mutual complacency, and reciprocal delight in each other, for this love, this delight, must have something to work upon. As there must be a Conjugal Relation, before the Husband can
take

take delight in his Wife, as his Wife; and the Wife in her Husband as her Husband.

3. That this *love of good will* in Christ; is the *Original Reason* of our transformation into the *Image of Christ*; whereby we become meet objects for that *other love of Complacency*.

4. Its true that *we love him*, as partaking of *his Nature*; but then its also *as true* that those Acts of love to, and delight in Christ, proceed from that *New Nature* which we derive from him.

5. The Love wherewith Christ Loves us, as *the price of his blood*, is a differing love from that wherewith he loves us *as his workmanship* created in Christ Jesus to good works.

6. I rejoyce however that we are owned to be *Christs workmanship Created to good works*: which it were not so, we had more reason to love *our selves*, to admire and deifie our own natural Abilities, which effected that *glorious workmanship*: And I see of late our Authour, takes to the *Church Catechism*; which had he attended to in time, had saved him half the Labour of his Book: - *My good Child! know that thou art not able to do these things of thy self (to love God, to believe in him, to fear him, with all thy heart with all thy mind, withal thy strength, to worship him to give him thanks to put thy whole Trust in him, &c.) nor to walk in the Commandments of God and serve him without his special Grace, which thou must learn at all times to call for by diligent prayer.*

7. The

7. The more we *exercise our selves* in the Love of Christ, the more *like him we grow*; and the *stronger bonds* are layd upon our Souls, to maintain the Union inviolable; but still there must precede an *Union*, which is the true Foundation of the Exercise of this Love of Delight and mutual Complacency. Ay but (says he) *Love is the great Cement of Union, which unites Interests, and thereby more firmly unites hearts.* Let him call it *the Cement*, or the *Soder*, or the *Glew*, it's all one to me; I conceive that *Interest is the Cement of Love*, and not *Love the Cement of Interest*: Men love because it's *their Interest* so to doe; but whether that Love that flutters up and down the world, a thing so unstable and desultory that we cannot tell where to have it, be a fit Pattern for the *heights, and lengths, and depths, and breadth of the Love of Christ*, ora just Measure of it, I very much question.

Many things we meet with that are full of delight, but one may take a Surfeit of Sweetmeats, and therefore I shall onely trouble the Reader with his Concluding Argument, taken from the Sacraments: *Which are* (says he) *the Instruments and Symbols of our Union with Christ.* And if by Christ he understands *the Church*, it's not worth the while to make a Controversie on't; we will grant, That Union with the Church consists in Union with it; and the surest Means to be United to the Church, is to be United to it; and this way seldom fails: But if he had a mind to con-

E c

clude

clude something else, he had done like a Neighbour to have informed us; for I must needs confess, I am in the dark: But yet we shall not lose all our labour: For these Sacraments represent both our external and real Union with him. And it's worth all our pains and patience, to hear one of his Lectures upon this Subject:

First, for our External Union; Baptism is a publick Profession of the Christian Religion, that we believe the Gospel, own his Authority, and submit to his Government:

Secondly, These Sacraments signifie our Real Union to Christ: Thus Baptism signifies our Profession of becoming New men; our profession of Conformity to Christ in his Death and Resurrection. Now look how much Conformity to Christs Death and Resurrection, is better than owning his Authority, and submitting to his Government, just so much is our Real Union, better than our external, which if one so exactly versed in the essential differences of things as our Author, had not told us other wise, ordinary Capacities had judged to be both one: That little advantage there is, the External Union carries it: For as to our External Union, Baptism (he tells us) is a Profession of it; but as to our Real Union, Baptism onely signifies a profession of it; and then it will be somewhat better to make a Profession of submission to Christs Government, than to make a signification of a Profession of Conformity to his Death. I shall therefore rather

rather acquiesce in the Judgement of the Catechism about the Signification of Baptism, than in our Authors; which makes this Question: *What is the inward and spiritual Grace?*
Ans. A death unto sin, and a New Birth unto Righteousness; for being by Nature born in sin, and the children of wrath, we are hereby made the children of Grace.

[4] His last, and most famous Observation is: *That Fellowship and Communion with God signifies, what he calls a Political Union:* And would we knew what that was: why it is this: *To be in fellowship with God and Christ signifies to be of that Society which puts us into a peculiar Relation to God; that God is our Father, and we his Children, that Christ is our Head and Husband, and Lord, and Master; and we his Disciples, and followers, his Spouse, and Body.* It's below the generosity of the Eagle, to catch Flies; an Employment more suitable to the impertinent humour of *Domitian*; and therefore it may be expected, that our Author should scorn to play so mean a Game, as to impose upon our weakness with the Ambiguity of a poor word. [To be in Fellowship,] carries a sound to a mere English Ear very like to [Union,] but if we examine either the Synonymous word [Communion,] or the Greek words, [*κοινωνία* and *κοινωνία*] which are rendred *Fellowship* and *Communion*; and how those words are used in Scripture, we may abundantly satisfy our selves, that they signify something very distinct

from, Union or Relation. Fellowship, and Communion, are words of the same import; and the Greek *κοινωνία* is indifferently render'd by either of them: 1 *Joh.* 1. 3. *καὶ ἡ κοινωνία ἡ ἡμετέρα*: *And truly our Fellowship, &c.* And *v.* 6. *If we say, that we have fellowship with him.* *Ἐὰν ἔπωμεν ὅτι κοινωνίας ἔχομεν μετ' αὐτοῦ*; 2 *Cor.* 3. 14. *ἡ κοινωνία τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος*: *The Communion of the Holy Ghost*; and the Greek word *μετοχή*, is once translated *Fellowship*: 2 *Cor.* 6. 14. *τίς γὰρ μετοχή*; *For what Fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness?* Now, what the general Nature of Fellowship, Communion, or Participation, and Communication, is; the Apostle will clear up to us, *Phil.* 4. 15. *Now ye Philippians know; That no Church communicated with me, as concerning Giving, and Receiving, but ye only*; *καὶ ἡμεῖς μὲν ἐκκλησία ἐκοινωνήσωμεν*; which he explains, (if there be need of that,) *v.* 16. *Te sent once and again unto my necessity.* Communion therefore, or Communication, is the Mutual bestowing of those good things which are in each others power, grounded upon some Union, and Relation between the Parties. And this is more fully expressed by that Scripture phrase, *κοινωνίας ἔχειν*: To have, hold, exercise, or maintain Communion, or Communication of all those good things which may be expected from each other in a Relation: 1 *Joh.* 1. 6. *κοινωνίας ἔχομεν*. I must profess my self therefore wholly dissatisfied with our Authors New Notion of Communion,

nion, That it signifies the same thing with Union: That *ἵσμις*, and *κοινωνία*, are Terms adequately Measuring each other: There must be first a Relation, before there can be a communicating of those good things which presuppose the Relation. Thus the Love of a Father to his Child, his Care over him, his Bounty to him, is founded in his Relation to him, as his Son; and the Childs filial Love, Duty, Fear, are all bottomed upon the Relation which he holds to his Father. Thus we conceive first a Real Union between the Head and the Members, before we can conceive the Head should communicate spirits to all the parts, to quicken them to Motion. And this the Apostle expresses, *Col. 2. 19*. That they who do not, *Hold the Head*, [that are not united to Christ,] can never receive from him those supplies, or Communications of Spiritual Nourishment, that they may *encrease with the encrease of God*. And thus must there be an Union between the Husband and the Wife, before there can be a Communication of what is in each others power: That is, they must give what they are, before they can give what they have: And this Order and Method is well observed in the Liturgy, (though our Author is pleased to make himself very merry with it) where the Man first takes the Woman to be his wedded Wife; and then assigns, or makes over what he has to her Use; *with all my worldly Goods I thee endow*: For he that gives Himself, will never

ver stick at a'l the Rest. And thus the first thing that God gives to his in Covenant, is *Himself*: Heb. 8. 10. *I will be their God*; and then follows the Communication of all his *Covenant Mercies*. v. 12. *I will be mercifull to their Iniquities, and remember their sins no more*: And in the same Order the Soul proceeds in its Restipulation with God: 2 Cor. 8. 5. *First gave their own selves to the Lord*. Now as the Union, or Relation is for kind, so also are the Communications that flow from, or follow upon the Relation and Union. If the Union be a more general Union, the Relation a more common Relation, the Communications in due proportion will be more general, and Common; we are Related to all men, none are so remote, but they are our Neighbours; but yet we have a more special and peculiar Relation to all Christians: And hence is it, that the Apostle apporitions out to us, the Nature of those good things that we ought to communicate to both, Gal. 6. 10. *Do good to all, but especially to them that are of the household of Faith*. * The great God as Creator, is Related to all; and therefore does good to all. Psal. 36. 6. *Thou preservest Man and Beast*: Yet, as he stands more nearly related as a Father to some, than others, so he communicates more choyse and peculiar Favours to them: Hence is that Prayer of David, Psal. 105. 4. *Remember me, O Lord, with the favour thou bearest to thine own People; O visit me with thy Salvation; that I may see the Good*

Good of thy Elect ones. And because the *Electing Love* of the Father, and the *Redeeming Love* of the Son, are exactly parallel, therefore has Christ a general *paragon*, as well as a special *exemplar*. 1 Tim. 4. 10. *He is the Saviour of all men, specially of them that Believe*: It was never doubted, but the Relation of a Master to his Servant ought to produce suitable Communications to that Relation: And yet those of a Father to his Child, are of another and sweeter Nature, those of the Husband to the Wife, yet more endearing; and those of the Head to the Members still more intimos and intrinsecal: Now that Communion is a Communication of Good things flowing from Union, the Apostle will not suffer us to doubt; Gal. 6. 6. *Let him that is taught in the Word, communicate unto him that teacheth in All Good things*: Where the Relation between the Teacher and the Disciple, is the Foundation of that Communication of all good things; but if indeed our Author will abide by his Notion, That Union and Communion are *both one*; Then if his Parishioners do but hear him preach, they may spare the Impertinency of Tythes, it is but *Altum Agere*, and Communion is satisfied in the Notion of Union; so that they have here a general Release of all Minute and Prædial Tythes, under his own hand, from the beginning of the World to this Day.

The Sophistry of our Authors Argument from 1 Job. 1. 3. we have already considered and discovered: He leads us now to 1 Cor.

E c 4

1. 9.

1. 9. *God is faithfull, by whom ye are called into the Fellowship of his Son Iesus*: All the advantage he can expect from these words, is upon a presumption of his Readers Simplicity, that he will not spy small faults; so be called into fellowship with Christ, cajouls the Ear into a Conceit of Union: But that which spoys all is, our Translation reads *unto the Fellowship*, or Communication, or Participation of his Son, and the Mischief on't is, the Greek reads, *in κοινωνίαν*: But let us see however, how he will improve it: *Where* (says he) *the Fellowship of Christ can signifie no more than fellowship with the Church, because the Apostle adds in the next Verse,* [I beseech you brethren, that you all speak the same thing, that there be no Divisions among you.] I confess he has a heavy hand at Reasoning, and it goes hard with us that must continually feel the weight of it: But yet,

1. The Apostles Argument will conclude as strongly from the Communications of Grace from Christ, unto Peace among our selves, as from Union, *q. d.* You have all been made partakers of the Communications of Grace and Peace from Christ; you have many mercies in hand, and more in hope, much in possession, but infinitely more in Reversion, and will you run into Factions among your selves? But,

2. The very plain Truth is: The Apostle argues neither the one way nor the other;
Versf.

Verse 9. has no such Influence upon *Verse 10.* but the Rise of his Discourse is from *Verse 3.* *Grace be unto you, and Peace from God our Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ.* Where you have:

First, The Union and Relation. God our Father: Our Lord and Saviour.

Secondly, The Communion that flows from that Relation: Grace and Peace, *i. e.* All new Covenant Mercies: And because whatever Grace, or Peace, comes from the Father as the Fountain and Spring, from the Son in a way of Purchase and Procurement, comes also from the Holy Ghost, by way of Immediate Efficiency; therefore it's called also, *κοινωνία τῶν ἀγαθῶν*, 2 Cor. 13. 14. *The Grace of our Lord Jesus, the Love of God, and the Communion, or Communication of the Holy Ghost, be with you all.* You all, that is, *The Church of God at Corinth, with all the Saints in Achaia,* Chap. 1. ver. 1. who are supposed to be already United to Christ, both in our Authors false Notion, and in the true. Now this Communication, he calls, *The Grace of God given them, or Communicated to them by Jesus Christ, Verse 4.* And shews the Measure of it, *Verse 5. Ye are enriched in every thing by Him.* And *Verse 8.* He shews that God would confirm them in, as well as enrich them with his Grace to the end: And for a Proof of this, he minds them of the Faithfulness, and Steadiness of God in his Covenant. *Verse 9. God is Faithful, by whom ye are sal-*

called unto the Communication of our Lord Jesus Christ. The end of your Effectual calling to an Union with Christ, is a Communication of this Grace and Peace from Christ. And then,

Thirdly, Our Authors Memory is very Treacherous. For first he observes; That Communion with God, signifies a Political Union; and that Political Union, was such a one as is between a Prince and his Subjects, pag. 156. And that, certainly, has the Persons of both, for the Terms of the Relation. And pag. 185. He observes, That our Fellowship with the Father and the Son, is founded on our Fellowship with the Christian Church, and therefore fellowship with the Father and the Son; and fellowship with the Christian Church, are two things really distinct, for it would be harsh to say, a thing is founded on it self. And yet after all this: Fellowship with Christ can signifie no more than Fellowship with the Church. And thus, the short and long of the Business, is this, Union with Christ, is Union with the Church: And Communion with Christ, is Communion with the Church: And Union with the Church, is Communion with the Church. *Quod erat Demonstrandum.*

But we are terribly Threatned with an Argument, from 2 Cor. 6. 14. *Be ye not unequally Yoked together with Unbelievers; Μὴ γίνεσθαι ἐνὶ ζυγῷ μετὰ ἀπίστων*; Where the Apostle refers to a Levitical Ordinance, *Deut. 22. 10. Thou shalt not Plow with an Ox, and an Ass.* In proportion to which, the Apostle forbids

bids Believers to joyn in the *same special*
League and Covenant, with Unbelievers. Now
 the Reason why he dissuades them from such
 an unequal union, is, because the end of all union,
 is a *Communion*, or *Communication*, each to,
 and with other in that Union. But to be sure,
 where there are such *Contrarieties of Interests*
 and *Inclinations*, in the Persons joyned toge-
 ther, there can be no assistance to the same
 common VVork: The Cedar in Lebanon, and
 the Thistle in Lebanon, are not qualified for a
 Match, for they will never serve and accom-
 modate each other in the Duties of the Relati-
 on. When the Wise God chose a VVife for
 Adam, he provided one that was Homogene-
 ous with him, *Bone of his Bone*, and *Flesh of*
his Flesh, that she might be a *Meet-help* for
 him. But now (says the Apostle) If you joyn
 your selves with Unbelievers; *τις υμῶν*: VVhat
 participation of good things can you expect
 from them, whose Religion is as contrary to
 yours, as *Righteousness is to Unrighteousness*?
 And *τις δύσγνωστα*; VVhat Communication
 can there be between *Light and Darkness*? Pa-
 gans can Communicate nothing to you but their
 uncleanness, and *I would not have you commu-*
nicate with the unfruitful Works of Darkness,
 Ephes. 5. 11. Again, *τις συμπάντων*: VVhat
 Concord hath Christ with Belial? VVhat
 Symphony or Harmony, can there be in your
 Conversations? You will be always Jarring?
 There will be no Melody or Musick in your
 Conferences: VVhen you would be praising
 your

to their Idols: so that never was there greater Confusion of Tongues at *Babel*, than there will be in your Society. And then, *is magic*; what Portion can a Believer have with an Unbeliever? He will not, ought not partake of the *Lords Table* with you; and you will not, ought not partake of the *Table of Devils* with him. For, *is overthrown*; what Consent, or Suffrage will the one give to the other? *The living God* will not vote for *dead and dumb Idols*: *The Arke* will never endure *Dagon*: How absurd therefore must it be, to enter into a Relation with them, with whom you can enjoy no Fellowship in that Relation?

One Reserve he has still left from the *Lords Supper*, whereby our Fellowship with God and Christ, are expressed, 1 Cor. 10. 16. *The Cup of Blessing which we bless, is it not the Communion of the Blood of Christ?*

Now (says he) it's called a Communion, because it signifies,

1. A Communion of Christians with each other.

2. A Fellowship with God.

That is, it's called a Communion because it's no Communion, but onely the sign of a Communion. There is indeed an outward and visible sign; and there is also an inward and invisible Grace, really exhibited and communicated from Christ by the Ordinance, to the worthy Receiver. And thus much he might have learn'd from the Church Catechism:

Qu. What is the inward part, or thing signified?

Ans.

Ans. *The Body and Blood of Christ, which are verily and indeed taken, and received of the Faithfull in the Lords Supper.*

Qu. *What are the Benefits whereof we are partakers Thereby?*

Ans. *The strengthening and refreshing of our Souls, by the Body and Blood of Christ; As our Bodies are by the Bread and Wine.*

And the Liturgy in the Office of the Supper, expresses, not onely a Communication of *reall Nourishment* from Christ, to our Souls; but a *mutual communication* of our *Praise and Thanksgiving* to God for Christ, and to Christ for his *Flesh and Blood*; which compleats the *Communion*: *The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ which was given for Thee, preserve thy Body and Soul into Everlasting Life; and Take, and Eat this, in remembrance that Christ dyed for thee; and feed on him in thy Heart by Faith, and be Thankfull.*

But to put this out of doubt, That all Communion is grounded upon Union, I will quote our Author to our Author; for Nothing cuts the Diamond like it self. *God (says he) entertains us at his Table as his own children.* Why then, let it be referred to the Man that comes next; Whether *sitting at Gods Table, does not presuppose us to be Children?* Surely, we are not therefore *Children* because we *sit at the Table*; but we therefore *sit at the Table*, because we are *Children*. Again, p. 152. Our Author (whose word ought to go far with himself) assures us, That *Baptism is the Sacrament*

of

of our Admission into the Church. There's our Union then however; and the Lords Supper finding us already united, affords us a communion, or a participation of those Privileges, which flow from that Union. So that, whether our Union to Christ, consist in our Union to the Church, or no; yet still there must be an Union to the Church, before we can hold Communion with it, in those Mercies and Blessings which Christ has entailed upon it.

And thus has our Author made a quick dispatch of Communion with Christ in the Lords Supper; could he but as fairly dispatch it out of all other Exercises of Religion, he might seriously Triumph, that he had cut off the Neck of all Religion at one Blow: Well, success waits upon the Bold Undertaker, and there's no hurt in a daring Attempt. *Prayer* (says he) *and Meditation, and such like Acts of Devotion, are no where called Communion with God.* Our Author is just now turning Quaker. "Thou man, where dost thou read, that the People of God put off their Hats, or wore Ribbands and Lace? But to satisfy him, *Prayer and Meditation are not called, nor are they Communion with God; but Means whereby, and Ways of Gods appointment wherein, we hold Communion with him: In these and other Ordinances we communicate to him the Affings of our Faith, Fear, Love, delight, Praise, &c. and by these he communicates to us of his Grace, Strength, Favour, Mercy, to help us in the time of our Need.* In Prayer we pour

our

and our hearts before him, Psal. 62. 8. In Prayer and Meditation, *We lift up our Souls to the Lord*, Psal. 25. 1. Hence that frequent Expression of the Ancient Christians, *Sursum Corda*, continued in the Liturgy: *Lift up your hearts*: *Ans. We lift them up to the Lord*: But a few dribbling Objections he has against this also.

1 Object. *Communion does not consist in Transient Acts.*

Ans. 1. Communion does consist in those permanent Effects conveyed by transient Acts; the Effect of Prayer abides, when the Act is over.

2. The Lords Supper is a Transient Act, both in opposition to Permanent and Immanent, and yet there is a real Communion between Christ and Believers therein.

2 Object. *You will not say, a poor Man has Communion with his Prince, when he puts up a Petition to him, to begg his Charity.*

Ans. It's more than our Author can tell, whether we will say so or no. If a Prince commands his Subjects, to make their Addresses to him, in all their streights; promising, that the great distance between them shall not prejudice their Supplications, and shall appoint a Person near and dear to himself, to receive from them, and present to him all their Petitions, that in his Name they may find Acceptation and Answer; if now his poor Subjects shall give faith to his Promises, make use of his Indulgence, own their Relation to him, and improve the Mediation

Mediation of that Master of Requests, and upon the Relief of their Wants, Redress of their Grievances, shall return their humble and hearty thanks; and learn to love their Prince more, to serve him better, to become more loyal Subjects; methinks here's that which may be called Communion grounded upon Union.

3 Obj. *To Pray to God, is an Act of Homage which we owe to him as our Creator and Father.*

Ans. I looked every moment when he should Confute himself; for now he will not deny, that *Relation to God* as our Creator and Father, precedes this Communion: *It's a Duty* (says he) *that results from Relation.* Therefore, (say I) *It's not the Relation it self:* And therefore I shall still conclude, that Communion does properly denote *the Communication of good things, bottom'd upon that Union and Relation we have to and with each other;* and that our Author has most wretchedly abused his Time, and his Reader, in a weak Endeavour to prove, *That Communion consists in Union;* and has merited the Character of *Hanno the Carthaginian* (given him by the great Historian,) That he was a Person *very skilfull in the Art of seeming Reverend.*

SECT. 2.

Of our Union to the Person of Christ.

THIS Section may well be called, Our Author's Lamentations; wherein he most passionately bewails, how some men have *obscured Plain things*, to his no small trouble (I assure you) to vindicate them to their *Primitive Clearness*. We (who are not privy to his Nocturnal Elucidations) do little think what pains it cost him to scowre off all that Rust, which (in so long a tract of time as Sixteen hundred years, through the Sleepiness of the Apostolick Fathers; and the Sluttishness of all the Christian Churches) Religion had contracted, to the day of the date of his Reformation. But there are others too that whisper out their *Complaints*, How Christ in the beginning of his Gospel, bequeathed to us a Religious Decent, but not Gawdy; Plain, but yet Powerful; not courting Profelytes with Meretricious Gallantry; but Matron-like Modesty! Whose Aetire was indeed more coarse, and home-spun, yet withall very warm, and fitted to its end: But now a-days all is trim'd up with Ribbands and Lace, and set off with Fan and Feather. It was a Complaint as old as *Austin*, That men loaded Religion with *several Burdens*, which God in mercy would have left free: So that the condition of the Jews was more tolerable, that were subject to Legal Sacraments, and not to the Presumptions of men. Thus every one can

G g

Plains

plain of faults, but very few that I can see will mend
ny.

I suppose our Author will be content, that the Reformation of *Worship* be committed to the *Churches* care; but for reducing *the Doctrine*, that's a Burden he has reserved for his *own shoulders*: And methinks I see him (like the sign of the *Atlas*, supporting the *Globe*) chearfully heaving at the weight, and yet never so much as once criple in the *Hams*.

God (says he) was pleas'd to institute a great many *Ceremonies*, and many of them of very obscure Signification, in the *Jewish Worship*, to aw their Childish Minds into a greater Veneration of his Majesty. Now let the Reader substract *A many*, out of *A great many*, and the *Remainder* will inform him, just How many of God's Institutions, had *Any light* in them. Had this Divinity falln into some mens fingers, they would perhaps have made desperate work with it: For, 1. Some might say, Nay then, if God's *own Ceremonies* were invented to aw *Childish Minds*, we can never hope for better from *Humane Ceremonies*, but that they should fright the *Churches Children* out of their wits. 2. Others would censure it as guilty of horrid Prophaneness, to assign such a Reason for God's sacred Institutions, as must imply, That he was forced to go *subtly* to work with his people, and to use the Artifice of *Mormo's* and *Scarce-crows* to fright them into Reverence: as women terrifie their children with *Robin* — with the *Ram-head* and *Bloody-bones*. And 3. Some would not stick to say, That surely some prying pate or other would have discovered the design, and then instead of conciliating more Reverence, it would certainly have exposed his *Ordinances*, if not the *Author* of them,

to contempt. But they who had seen Mount Sinai all on flame, and smok; they who had heard the sound of that dreadful Trumpet, who felt the Earth-quake without, and a greater Heart-quake within at the presence of the Almighty God, were convinced that God needed not to have recourse to those little, slight of Ceremonies to *aw* *their Childish Minds into a Veneration of his Majesty.*

4. Others expect when our Author should make God himself a Ceremony, contrived to manage this bulky and unruly World with more ease: For some it seems, have got it by the the end, that *Primus in Orbe Deus fecit Timor.* 5. But all agree in this,

That this Doctrine argues our Authors gross ignorance in the true end of those Ceremonies: All which had a fair and clear Prospect towards a Redeemer, Col. 2. 17. *They were a shadow of good things to come, but the body was of Christ.* But men may speak their pleasure, our Author has determined against them, That God's Institutions were to fright Children: But now (says he) *in these last days, God sent his Son to make a plain, easie, and perfect Revelation of his Will; to publish such a Religion as may approve it self to our Reason.* Well! whatever we have gained, I am sure Religion has got no great matter by the Bargain: For then *their Reason* was to crouch to God's Religion, though in an obscure Ceremony; but now poor Religion must stoop to Reason, must appear before the Tribunal of Reason; and if it does not acquit itself well, and give a Rational and Satisfactory account of its Tendries, it must be bored through the Tongue with a red-hot Iron, for an Heretick: And which is the worst on't, this Reason holds its Consistory in our Authors brain, so that

if he be but troubled with a Rheumatism, the droppings of his Nose must be imposed upon us for *Twice distilled Reason*. - Nor yet can I perceive, wherein Religion does more *approve it self to our Reason*, than formerly to *theirs*: For, 1. As to the *Moral part* of Religion, that was as agreeable to Natural Light then, as 'tis now; Murder, Adultery, Stealing, were equally condemned by the Sentiments of all Mankind in all Ages. 2. For the *Ceremonial part*, which depends upon the mere Authority and Sovereign pleasure of the Legislator, they had as good Reason for their obedience, as we can claim for ours. There was as fair Reason pleadable for *Circumcision*, as for *Baptism*; for the *Passover*, as the *Supper*; the *first Reason* from which all instituted Worship springs, being the *Will*, and the *last Reason* into which all is resolved, being the *Glory of the Supreme Law-giver*. 3. The *Perfection of Christ's Revelation*, above that of *God to the Jews*, lies not in giving us a new Moral Law, or adding any thing to it; but in exhibiting *Himself*, as the *Substance* of their *Ceremonial Law*, who was revealed (though less clearly revealed) to them in *Types and Figures*.

And now Dr. Owen shall have a short truce and respite from Persecution, whilst the storm falls upon Dr. Jacomb. Some cavilling spirits have made a Question, How the Air and Earth could afford sufficient Matter for Rain to make an Universal Deluge? But I more wonder, whence our Author could furnish himself with such a vast stock of scolding Materials and Utensils, as might maintain such a constant Tenor of Fury and Rage against these men? What Cistern or Receptacle is able to hold such a body of Rancor, as may feed that stream which

which perpetually turns his Mill? Some thought, surely, these Doctors had a great hand in burning the City; or have rob'd the Temple at Delphos; or however that of *Tholouse*. But I relieved my self against that Suspicion, by a seasonable Consideration, That it's not the custom to bear ill, but for doing well: And therefore my thoughts began to reel to the other side; Whether possibly they had not club'd together, to build, or endow some Hospital, or Colledge; or had bought in all the Impropriations, and laid them to the Church, because it must be some glorious Work, that could purchase our Author's Indignation; and at no lower rates could they entitle themselves to his severe displeasure. At last with much beating about, I found that they had both zealously and strongly engaged against the *Socinians*, for the Doctrine of the Church of *England*; and then no Penance shall ever expiate their Guilt, or procure an Indulgence for such Delinquency. But then the Difficulty recurred upon me, Why he should slip his Hold of *the one*, and fasten upon *the other*? Yet I considered, that *Nature is much delighted with Variety*: And I have heard some that pretend to know something in those matters, say, That it's not Policy to fight long with one Enemy; for in a while, they will understand our manner of fighting, and become as good at our Weapon as our selves: But now attend!

When we enquire (says he) what the Union between Christ and Believers is? They answer, It's a Mystical Union through the Spirit and Faith. And truly they answer pretty well! For that it is a Mystical Union, they produce the Apostle Paul for their Voucher, Ephes. 5:32. This is a great Mystery, but I

Speak concerning Christ and his Church. The Apostle is there discoursing of *that intimate Oneness*, (good Sir be not angry!) that is between the Husband and the Wife: That the Wife is the Husbands own self, *vers. 28. He that loveth his wife, loveth himself.* Now covertly, the Apostle, with one and the same labour, will shew us how *mystical and intimate* that Union is, which is between Christ and his Church, *v. 29. No man ever hated his own flesh, but nourisheth and cherisheth it, even as the Lord the Church: For we are members of his body, and of his flesh, and of his bones. And for this cause* (says the Apostle, *vers. 31.) a man shall leave Father and Mother, and cleave to his Wife, and they two shall be one flesh*: But now (says he) that which I have discoursed to you will seem very abstruse; and, as some will phrase it, *mystical nonsense, and unintelligible Drollery*; but, *I speak concerning Christ and his Church*: For however this be true, That the Husband and Wife are but one flesh, in the eye and consideration of the Law; yet it's more eminently true concerning Christ and his Church, who in the consideration and eye of God, are but one Spirit. All Metaphors and Similitudes taken from outward things, come infinitely short, and cannot decypher that *mystical Union*, which is between Christ, and all true Believers. Your Political Union, is but a new-invented Bawble; your Natural Union, is lean, and hungry; your Civil Union is low, and flat; it is a Mystical Union! Ay, but this Paul was an obscure Author, and writes very darkly: But yet he may comfort himself the better under this hard Censure, since God himself cannot escape the Lash of Virulent Pens, emboldned with an *Imprimatur*; whose Institutions are reproached, to be of *Obscure Signification*,

tion, to *awaken the Childlike Minds* of men into *Veneration*. And then, that the *internal Ligaments* of this Union, are the *Spirit and Faith*; as the Scripture is free in affirming; so our Author is fully in denying; only he throws away a little scornful Drivel upon it. *This Mystical is a hard word!* Let it be so! Dr. Jacob shall explain it, on *Rom. 8. p. 42.* And first, (says the Doctor) *There is an Union of three Persons in one Nature.* 2. *There's the Union of two Natures in one Person.* 3. *There's an Union of Persons,* where yet *Persons and Natures are distinct.* Concerning which he observes, 1. *Here's an Union, but no Transmutation, Commixtion, or Confusion.* Here's an *Union of Persons*, but no *Personal Union*. Say you so Doctor? then I promise you, here's one has made bold with some of your names; for page 103, he tells his Reader, and me amongst the rest, That *these men place all their hopes of Salvation in a personal Union with Christ.* But pray Dr. go on! The *Person of Christ is united to the Person of a Believer, and the Person of a Believer to the Person of Christ.* But for this our Author has a dry flax; *As it must needs be where the Person of Christ, is united to the Person of a Believer!* Silly Man! the Doctor observes, that *Christ is united to a Believer by the Spirit; and a Believer united to Christ by Faith.* Though the *Terms* of the Relation are the same in Christ's Union with a Believer, and a Believer's Union with Christ, the *Bond* that unites them is *Distinct*. A Father is related to his Son, and a Son to his Father, yet *Paternity* is one thing, and *Filiation* another; and the *Foundations* of these Relations differ: The *Foundation* of the one, is *to beget*; of the other, *to be begotten.* But (says the Doctor) *Faith is the uniting*

Grace: and this Faith receiving Christ, 1 John 29. it must also unite us to the Person of Christ: But of this our Author doubts, because men are not united to every thing they receive. Alas-a-day! yet when a Master receives any one to be his Servant, that Reception is the bottom of his Relation. If a Woman receives a person to be her Husband, that Reception creates an Union. But I had rather the Reader would give himself the satisfaction to peruse the Doctors Book, where he shall find these things laid down with Modesty, backed with strength of Reason, Scripture, and the suffrage of Learned Christians. And if our Author thinks, that a few Squirts and Flashes (which he is resolved to call Wit) be a sufficient Confutation, he shall enjoy the Contentment of admiring his own Excellencies, without any Rival. Again; This Union (says the Doctor) may be thus described, 'Tis that Supernatural, Spiritual, Intimate Oneness, and Conjunction between the Person of Christ, and the Person of Believers, through the Bonds of the Spirit and Faith, upon which there follows mutual and reciprocal Communion each with others. I will not conceal from the Reader my thoughts; I really expected, that our Author should have highly commended the Doctors Modesty, who in a subject so Sublime, as might well exercise the Tongues of Angels, should draw his Description with a *Peu estre*, it [may be described:] And the rather, because by that means he has not excluded our Authors greater Abilities from travelling in the subject, but left room enough for his Defining Faculty: But instead of that, I see he's Angry still, though impotent. This Oneness and Conjunction are hard words! So they are indeed! It's hard to say,

When
or W
into
par
left
the
cable
the
was
Mac
gon
But
toler
Sci
even
as O
of
thor
Bon
if
Doc
for
Lor
wit
Rit
for
vie
dre
ap
tea
Ch
lie
A

Whether they will prove Arabic, or Syriac, or Welsh or Wild-Irish : But to be sure, they came but lately into England, and are not yet made Denizens to purchase our Author's favour. The great danger is, lest we should mistake *this Conjunction*, for one of the *Eight parts of Speech*. Oh Sirs ! what inextricable perplexities has this one lewd word involved the Nation in, since it landed ? The old *Shibboleth* was an innocent *Chrysom* to it. *Political Union* and *Machine*, are sorry Speakers to it : Indeed *Tetrachymogon*, and *Synantigorematical* come pretty near. But Oh *Conjunction* ! This *Conjunction* is not to be tolerated in a Land professing the Seven Liberal Sciences. And yet after all this, I dare venture an even Wager, That as many understand *Conjunction*, as *Opposition*, and more than know what to make of *Antithesis* ; and yet that never choak'd our Author, but he could swallow it without making any Bones of it, or a Vespasian-face at it. p. 264. But if some small splinter should stick in his throat, the Doctor will be that charitable Crane to pluck it out ; for he adds, *Believers are said to be joyned to the Lord*, 1 Cor. 6. 17. Now if no words will down with him but such as melt in the mouth, let him substitute *Joyning* for *Conjunction*, and that will serve for a Vehicle, with a spoonful of Syrup of Mulberries to supple the passage.

Our Author finding that the Doctor has bewildred himself, will endeavour to help him out. It's a plain case (says he) if *Christ and Believers are united*, their Persons are united too ; for the Person of *Christ*, is *Christ himself*, and the Persons of *Believers*, are *Believers themselves* ; and I cannot understand how they should be united without their Persons ;

but

but then they are united by mutual Relations; as the Person of a Prince and his Subjects, of a Husband and his Wife, are united by mutual affections. This I confess a surpassing kindness; and therefore that frequent reckonings may make us long Friends, I shall call some small Follics to account, ere they be forgotten. 1. I am more confirm'd in my old Observation, That our Author writes only from hand to mouth. He has told us, p. 157. That our Union to Christ, is not an Union to his Person, but consists in a sincere Union to his Church. And so again, p. 151, and yet now, If Christ and Believers are united, their Persons are united too; for he cannot understand (no not for his heart, I warrant you) how they should be united without their Persons. 2. He charges the Doctor with owning an Adhesion, nay a Natural Adhesion of Persons. I confess, I never admired any mans Confidence more; that in the face of the Doctors words, which he himself had quoted; directly affirming the contrary, should charge him with asserting, a Natural Adhesion of Persons: Thus he reports the Doctors words, The Person of Christ and Believers are united, and yet it's no Personal Union. Again, the Doctor thus, It's a Spiritual, and Supernatural Conjunction. Our Author had need tell nothing but Truth; for he is the poorest qualified for a Liar, that I have met withal: And now let it be referred to the Groom-Porter, Whether Adhesion be not as like to choak narrow throats, as Conjunction. 3. He says, Christ and Believers are united by mutual Relations: And then makes a Quire upon't, Whether all the Absurdities he would fasten upon the Doctors words, will not recoil upon his own: For it signifies no more, than if he had said, Christ

Christ and Believers are united by their Union, and related by their Relation; and thus Christ, is Christ; and Believers, are Believers; and Union, is Union.

The Truce is now expired, and he is once again falling upon Dr. Owen: For as the Serpents in *Africa* lay aside their Poyson whilest they drink, and then presently suck it up again; so I was pretty secure, our Author would lick up that vomit again, which he had cast in Dr. *Jacomb's* face, that he might serve the other with the same sawce. But while I am considering his Extravagances, there comes to my hand an Answer from the Doctor, wherein since he has condescended to chastise our Author in person, it may justly supersede any further attempt of mine in his Vindication.

At p. 243. I meet again with our Author, where he falls upon that weighty point of Justification: In his exposing of which Truth, he takes occasion from a passage in Dr. O. (I see I must mention him again) *Com. p. 45. There is no man whatever, that hath any wants, in reference to the things of God; but Christ will be to him that which he wants: (I speak of those [N. B.] who are given him of the Father.) Is he Dead? Christ is Life! Is he weak? Christ is the Power of God! Hath he a Sense of Sin upon him? Christ is Compleat Righteousness!* Jer. 23. 6. *The Lord our Righteousness.* Which words being fortified with express Scripture, it concerned our Author to take good advice, and to go gingerly to work in perverting of them. Two Artifices he uses, which like Fire and Water, will make the strongest Cloth shrink. And, 1. He lops off one whole Sentence, p. 214. and then exclaims. *This sounds like Universal Redemption!* What, down-right Arminianism? Really

I am sorry for't! Is the Doctor *sheer gone over to the Remoustrants*? Come! come Sir! you have a Card in your Sleeve; pray produce it! I *peak* (says the Doctor) of those who are given him of the Father. Now where are your ears? Does this *think like Universal Redemption*? But so true is the old Observation, *He that is prepossess'd with an Opinion finds it in all he reads*. 2. If that way fails, another will hit it. *What Comfort is this to us* (says he) *that Christ was Righteous, if we continue wilful, and incorrigible sinners?* Yes, says the Doctor, *best thou a sense of sin upon thee? Christ is Compleat Righteousness*. Fie upon it! put on a Mask for shame! Is the Soul that labours under the sense of some particular sin, a wilful and incorrigible sinner? It's the repenting, the broken, and the sorrowful sinner, that the Doctor directs to Christ. Our blessed Saviour has invited those that labour, and are heavy-laden, to come unto him; promising, that he will give them rest. I wonder our Author could forbear twitting him, that he encouraged wilful and incorrigible sinners? But, pray, what would our Author say to a Soul that has the sense of sin upon him? without peradventure, *Repent of thy sin, forsake thy sin, &c.* And does he think that Repentance will save a wilful and incorrigible sinner? one that Repents and sins, and sins and Repents again, and goes on in a circle of sinning, and half-repentance? Say but the same for the Doctor: He Counsels the Soul, under the sense of sin, to believe; but then it's only the Repenting sinner that will, that can, that ought to make his Address to Christ, that he may find rest to his Soul.

For our Author's Method in prosecuting this great Point, I dare not warrant it. Such as it is, the

Read
to F
the
Chr
ture
God
ness
place
Lord
turn
and
begin
Chri
scou
Righ
shou
less
they
ted I
Lord
Wor
by I
of a
it to
he
time
bard
one
Goff
font
pre
pro
scou
pre

Reader shall have it as cheap as I had it; my duty is to Follow, and not to Dissure.

[11.] His first enquiry will be, *In what sense Christ is called our Righteousness?* and what the Scripture intends by those Phrases of, *The Righteousness of God; the Righteousness of Faith; or, The Righteousness of God by Faith?* He begins with that famous place, Jer. 23. 6. where Christ is expressly called the *Lord our Righteousness*. To which our Author returns three things; a pitiful Scoff, a woful Evasion, and a wretched Answer, worse than both. 1. He begins with a Scoff. A very exprest place to prove that Christ is our Righteousness; that is, that the only Righteousness, wherewith we must appear before God, is the Righteousness of Christ imputed to us. Who these men should be that thus expound it; I cannot Divine, unless it be the first Reformers of this Church; and they do indeed tell us, *Artic. 11.* That we are accounted Righteous before God, only for the Merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, and not for our own Works and Deservings: Wherefore that we are justified by Faith only, is a most wholesome Doctrine, and full of comfort. And I believe our Author experienced it to be a most sweet and comfortable Doctrine, when he subscribed it for a fat Benefice. But in the meantime, these men (whoever they be) have a very hard task on them. For one while they must not draw one Conclusion from the Person of Christ, which his Gospel has not expressly taught; to use their own Reasons to deduce one single Instance from Gospel-premisses, his present Death. But what now if they produce exprest Scripture, that Christ is our Righteousness? Why, that's as bad! for this is to interpret Scripture by the sound of words. 2. He retreats

to a most woful Evasion, *Is there no other possible sense to be made of this Phrase?* If it be possible to procure another Sense for Love or Money, it shall never go thus: The Cause looks with a very desperate face, when once it comes to this; when men are ready to shoot the Pit, and only watch for the Creep-hole of a bare Possibility. If they intended honestly, they would lay things together as well as they can; labour to find out the meaning of God's Spirit, with Sobriety and Humility, and never strain their Wits, and vex and torture the Scripture with utmost Possibilities: The Text tells us, that *the name whereby Christ shall be called, is the Lord our Righteousness*. Now it's granted, that this was not designed to be his *Prenomén*, or *Cognomen*, that which should distinguish him in Common Discourse from other persons; and therefore, *He shall be called*, is no less than, *He shall Really be our Righteousness*: Thus, 1 John 3. 1. *Behold what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called* (that is, that we should become) *the sons of God*: Isa. 9. 6. *His name shall be called* (i. e. he shall Really be) *Wonderful, Counsellor, The Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace*. The true intent and meaning of which place, I know how some have attempted to elude, by this fine device of the Possibility of another meanings; and whether our Author sharpened his weapon at their forge, he knows best. But, 3. He returns an Answer worse than both the other: *Righteousness in Scripture is a word of a very large sense, and sometimes signifies no more than Mercy, Kindness, Beneficence; and so the Lord our Righteousness, is the Lord who does us good*. But, 1. Is it not vainly supposed, That for Christ to do us good,

good, is inconsistent with being our *Righteousness* ?
 2. Though Christ be a Redeemer of Mercy, Kindness, and Beneficence ; yet he is no-where called, *The Lord our Mercy, The Lord our Kindness, The Lord our Beneficence* ; Which clearly proves, that when he is called, and really is, *The Lord our Righteousness*, the expression implies more than an *Imparting*, or *Communication* of good things to us. Hence some would say, That if our Author's Conscience were not larger than the sense of this word, he had never given so stretching an Answer. But (says he) *Righteousness signifies that part of Justice, which consists in relieving the oppressed. Isa. 54. 17. Their Righteousness is of me, saith the Lord, which is a parallel expression to, The Lord our Righteousness, and signifies no more, than that the Lord would avenge their Cause, and deliver them from all their Enemies* : So that all the benefit we are to expect from Christ, is *Temporal Salvation and Deliverance*. To which I answer : 2. That the Reason of Christ's glorious Name, *The Lord our Righteousness*, assigned by the Prophet, that in his days *Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely*, is interpreted by the Angel, *Matth. 1. 21. to be this, He shall be called Jesus, for he shall save his people from their sins*. And the end why God raised up his Son Jesus in the World, is expressly assigned to be, *To bless his people, in turning away every one of them from their iniquities, Acts 3. 26*. Thus *Rom. 11. 26. Out of Zion shall come the Deliverer, and he shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob*. To turn away iniquity from us ; and to turn us away from iniquity, is I hope something of a more useful import, than to relieve the injured and oppressed, and deliver them from their Enemies.

I do not at all envy our Author, therefore the glory of his discovery, that for God to justifie good men, is to deliver them from the violence and injuries of their Enemies: And I would gladly hope, that all good men have something better wherein to glory. In Jer. 33. 16. the Church is called, *The Lord our Righteousness*; because the only glories in the Righteousness of Christ, her Head and Husband, to whom being so nearly related, and with whom being so closely united, his Righteousness, is her Righteousness; and therefore she, who upon the account of the imperfection of her Inherent Righteousness, can find, no, nor the least, matter of boasting before God, yet has wherewith to Triumph in Christ her Saviour; Isa. 45. 24. Surely, shall one say, In the Lord have I Righteousness: In the Lord shall all the seed of Jacob be justified, and shall glory. Now the Apostle, whom I take to be a competent Interpreter of Scripture, assures us, that God has taken special care, that in his dispensing of Grace to sinners, No flesh shall glory in his presence, 1 Cor. 1. 29. which he has well provided for ver. 30. since Christ is made unto us of God for Righteousness; and therefore he that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord: Which is exactly parallel to that of Isa. 45. 24. In the Lord shall all the seed of Jacob be justified, and shall glory. Come we now to our Author's Interpretation of Isa. 61. 11. which is of the same leaven with the former: I will greatly rejoyce in the Lord, my soul shall be joyful in my God: For he both clothed me with the garments of Salvation, and covered me with the robe of Righteousness, &c. This Text one may perceive struck cold to his heart, and he gives us as cold an Answer, that's ready to freeze between his lips.

The

The Garments of Salvation (says he) and the *Robe of Righteousness*, signifie those great Deliverances God promised to Israel. Signifie! I would our Author would write a Dictionary of the Signification of words. We use to say, *A bad Answer, is better than none*: Reform the Proverb for shame; for such an one is worse than none. 1. It's evident, that the Triumph of the Church was upon the view of Jesus Christ, *vers. 1. Anointed to preach Good-Tidings to the meek, to bind up the broken-hearted, to proclaim liberty to the Captives, and the opening of the Prison to them that are bound: To proclaim the acceptable Year of the Lord*: Which our Saviour Christ applies to himself, *Luk. 4. 18, 19.* when he was far from working out for the Jews those great Deliverances by improbable means, which should make them glorious in the eyes of men. 2. The Virgin Mary quotes this very place, *Luke 1. 46, 47. My soul doth magnifie the Lord, and my spirit hath rejoiced in God my Saviour*; where the joy of her heart broke out at her lips, in Contemplation of that Eternal Redemption wrought out by him, in whom she could more seriously glory as her Saviour, than as her Son: And it's a wonder to me then, men can patter over their *Magnificat* every day, and not observe it. 3. It's observable, that the word *תְּכַנֵּן*, which we render [Decketh] signifies to Adorn as a Priest; and implies, that Christ as our High-Priest, shall present us acceptable to God upon his Accounts. 4. There's nothing more familiar with the Spirit of God, than to clothe Evangelical Mercies, in a Mosaical Dress; and to express New-Testament Salvation, in Old-Testament Phrase: Thus Gospel-Believers, are understood by Israel; the Church, by the Temple; Evan-

H h

gelical

gical Ministers by the Legal Priests; and the covering of Sin; by the covering of Nakedness; and by the decking with Ornaments, and adorning with Jewels, the representing true Believers, accepted with God through a better Righteousness than their own.

[2.] The Reader would admire to hear these glorious Gospel-Promises, recorded in the Old-Testament, thus interpreted to bare skin and bone; But our Author confesses, he swarms with prejudices against the Doctrine of Imputed Righteousness. When Prejudice sits upon the Bench, it's like to go very ill with poor Truth that stands at the Bar. As a Bribed Fancy will admit the most feeble Appearances, for plain Demonstrations of what it longs should be True; So a mind fore-stalled with prejudice, will despise the clearest evidence, for what it desires to be false. And we need no other instance of all this, than our Author's great Indisposition and Averseness to receive the present Truth.

And, 1. I perceive he is very much stumbled at one thing; That in all our Saviour's Sermons, there's no mention of his Imputed Righteousness. Now because the same Charity that commands me, not to lay a stumbling-block in the way of my Neighbour, enjoins me also to remove it out of his way, or, however, to help him over it; the ensuing Considerations will afford him that Civility, if he please to accept it. 1. If our Saviour had mentioned the Imputation of his Righteousness a thousand times over, he could easily have evaded it at his rate of answering; for he might have said, This is but to interpret Scripture by the sound of words; or if that had been too frigid, that it's sufficient to say, The words may possibly have a nother meaning, though he could not

not tell what that should be; or, that by the *Imputation of Christ's Righteousness*, no more is meant, but the *Accepting of our own Righteousness*, which Christ has commanded in the Gospel. 2. It may be of good use to him to consider, Whether Christ's Silence raised his prejudice against the Doctrine; or his own prejudice against the Doctrine, raised the conceit that Christ was silent in it? Whether it was the want of an Object to be seen; or the want of eyes to see the Object? For most men are *deaf*, when they have no mind to hear; and *blind*, when they have no will to see. For, 3. Christ in his Sermons has plainly revealed the case to be such between God and man, that without a better Righteousness than their own, they are all lost for ever, *Matth. 5, 19. He that breaks the least of these Commandments, shall be called least in the Kingdom of Heaven, that is, shall never come there.* Now the universal Suffrage of all mens Consciences is, That there is no man that *lives, and sins not*; and therefore Christ has determined upon him, that he shall *never enter into the Kingdom of Heaven*. I never yet heard, that God has dispenced with one jot or tittle of the Moral Law; but, *Do this and live*, is as strictly exacted as ever: So that unless a *Surety* be admitted, and the Righteousness of another owned, the case of all the Sons of Adam is deplorable and desperate. To deny then the Righteousness wherein the believing sinner may stand before this Righteous and Holy God, is to affirm the Eternal Damnation of all the World. 4. Christ has plainly discovered to us such ends of his Death and Sufferings, as evidently prove the impossibility of being justified by our own Righteousness, *Matth. 20, 28.* He gave, τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτῆς ὡς λύτρον αἰνι-
H h 2 πομένον,

to Man, his Life, [or Soul,] a Ransome, [a Redem-
 ption-price,] for [instead of] many: Which
 is no whit less than that of the Apostle, 2 Cor. 5. 21.
 He was made sin for us (who knew no sin) that we
 might be made the Righteousness of God in him: And
 the same with Isa. 53. 10. It pleased the Lord to
 bruise him, when he shall make his Soul an Offering
 for sin, &c. Again, Matth. 26. 28. This is the Blood of
 the New-Testament, which is shed for the Remission
 of the sins of many. Whence it's plain, that God
 in pardoning sin, in justifying and accepting the
 sinner, has such a respect to the Satisfaction of Christ
 in our stead, as may properly be called, the Imputa-
 tion thereof to us. 5. Though Christ mention
 not the Imputation of his Righteousness, &c. to us,
 yet has he mentioned that Righteousness, which it's
 certain from the Scriptures, must be imputed to Be-
 lievers, or they can have none of that benefit by it,
 which they are said to have, Matth. 3. 15. Christ
 fulfilled all Righteousness: and vers. 17. In him (or
 upon his account) God is well pleased, comes to
 delight in Believers, whom he accepts in the Beloved,
 Ephes. 1. 6. Ἐπεὶ ἡμεῖς ἐν τῷ ἀγαπημένῳ;
 He hath graciously accepted us in his Beloved one.
 Hence it is the Holy Ambition of all the Saints,
 2 Cor. 5. 9. to be accepted of him, or in him, Εὐ-
 πέσοι αὐτῷ ἐν αὐτῷ: That regard then which God
 has to the Obedience of Christ, as the Reason for
 which he accounts a Believer righteous, we judg,
 may commodiously be called, the Imputing of
 Christ's Righteousness to them, without the Leave,
 License, or Faculty of our Author.

A second Prejudice that is deep-rooted in our
 Author's breast against this Doctrine, is, That Christ
 exacts

exalts from men a Righteousness of their own, if they would find mercy with God. A Righteousness of their own? Ay, but let them be sure they come honestly by it. The Righteousness of Christ must be made ours, or else we shall never find mercy with God: We must also have another Righteousness of our own, an Inherent Righteousness, if ever we expect to enter into the Kingdom of Heaven, and find mercy with God in his great Day. But what is that Righteousness for which we are just and accepted with God? But for the removing of this small prejudice, may he please to consider: 1. How easie it is to vapour and make a flourish with those Texts that require an Inherent Righteousness, as a necessary Qualification for Eternal Salvation; and yet how hard to produce one place that mentions our own Inherent Righteousness, as that which answers God's holy Law, makes Reconciliation with God, and constitutes the sinner spotless and blameless before God, the Holy, Righteous Judge; yet such a Righteousness we want, and such a one we must have. 2. Our own Righteousness is very pleasing and acceptable to God in Christ, being the fruit of Faith, and following after Justification. So says the Church of England, Artic. 12. But (says She) Works done before the Grace of God, and the Inspiration of the Spirit, are not pleasing to God, forasmuch as they spring not out of Faith in Christ, Artic. 13. Which two Articles I shall leave to our Author to confute, at his best leisure.

A third Block which I perceive lies in his way is, That our Saviour should never once warn his Hearers, to beware of trusting to their own Righteousness. But,

1. Christ preach'd to the Jews, who had had warn-

ings know to beware of splitting upon that Rock: They might have taken warning from the Churches Confession, *Isa. 64. 5. We are all as an unclean thing, and all our Righteousnesses are as filthy rags.* All the warning in the World signifies nothing to them that are resolved to interpret, *Our own Righteousness*, by *Ceremony and Hypocrisie.* Had Christ inculcated the danger, even to Tautology, all may be evaded by that happy Gloss, which he keeps Leiger by him: True indeed, he warns us to beware of *our own Righteousness*, but he intends no more hereby, than the works of the Ceremonial, and external acts of the Moral Law. 3. Christ had indeed given them fair warning, but if they will not take it, the sin must lie at their own doors, and the Condemnation upon their own heads, Luke 18. 9. *He spake a Parable to them that trusted in themselves, that they were righteous, and despised others, &c.* Now it may seasonably be here remembred: 1. What was the design of this Parable? And that the Evangelist tells us, was to meet with them that trusted in themselves, *μεγαλυντες εαυτους*, men that presumed very highly upon their own Abilities, to answer the Law of God; and therefore despised others, who made such a stir about their own Impotency to keep it, and kept such a coyl about the shortness of their obedience to it; like the poor Publican, who being conscious to himself of both, makes his retreat to, and shelters himself in the free Grace, and rich Mercy of God to miserable sinners. 2. It will be seasonable to enquire, *What that Righteousness was*, upon which the Pharisee in the Parable so stiffly insisted, as that in which he durst adventure to appear before God? And that (as our Saviour puts the case) was a *Righteousness made up*
of

of obedience to Gods Commands : And those both Prohibitory, he was no Extortioner, no Adulterer, no Unjust Person; and Affirmatively, he paid his Tythes exactly, (which will go a great way) and fasted twice a week. 3. Let it be considered, that however many of the Pharisees of those days were Hypocrites, yet our Saviour frames his Parable of a Pharisee, not according to what many of them were, but what they seemed to be, and were reputed for amongst men, who admired their Sanctity, and revered their Devotions; and therefore he describes not a Person acting his part well upon the Stage, but living up to very high Attainments of Nature. For, 1. The duties instanced in, are only some particulars, in the name of all the rest: He instances in his praying to, and praising of God, which comprehend all the duties of the First Table: His freedom from Adultery, Extortion; and in a word, from Injustice, which is the whole of the Second Table. Again, He instances in duties of the Judicial Law, paying Tythes; and of the Ceremonial, Fasting; with a little touch perhaps of Supererogation, [Twice in the week.] 2. When Christ introduces a person, saying, he was no Adulterer, we may reasonably suppose, he taught him to speak in the proper sense of the word which Christ himself allows. Now in Christ's Dialect, to be no Adulterer, is not to commit it with the heart, Mat. 5. still abating for Humane Frailties. And, 3. This is evident, because our Saviour describes not this Pharisee, as praying in the corners of the streets, or in the Synagogues, to be seen of men; but in obedience to God's Command, Going up to the Temple to pray; and there praying to God, *πρὸς ἑαυτὸν*, in his own heart, between God, and his own Soul:

All which evidently prove, that our Saviour puts not the case of a *stinking Hypocrite*; but of one who went as far as Nature's legs would carry him. But, 4. The miscarriage of this Pharisee lay not in this, that he *was*, what he pretended he *was not*; or *was not*, what he pretended he was; but that he *trusted to himself* for a Righteousness, to be compounded out of all these Ingredients, wherein he would dare to stand before God, and in despising others, which is the natural Product of Self-Righteousness: And yet upon our Author's Principles, I see not why he might not trust to himself, that he was Righteous, if Righteousness be to be made out of Obedience; and despise others too, since *his own free-will* exerted, and *natural strength* improved, had made him differ from another, even from *that Publican*.

But yet, 4. There's one Prejudice more remaining, which perhaps may stick more with him than all the rest: He is apt to admire our Saviour's Sermons in the first place, before the Writings of the Apostles, though inspired men. I should be loth to weaken his Admiration of our Saviour's Sermons: But he may do well to examine, Whether his Aptness to admire them before other Sermons given forth by the same Spirit, may not proceed from great Ignorance, or a worse Principle? For though our Saviour's Person had more Authority than the Persons of the Apostles; yet the Writings of the Apostles are of equal Authority with those of the Evangelists, to command our Faith and Obedience. The Epistles of S. John are indited by the same Spirit by which he penned the Gospel: 'Tis the Authority of Christ in both, the Intallible Spirit speaking in both, which are the Reason of our Belief of both: All Scripture is given by

by Divine Inspiration, 2 Tim. 3.18. The same Spirit of Christ that spake in the Prophets of the Old Testament, and the Apostles in the New, 1 Pet. 1.11. And such Comparisons must needs be very odious, where the Spirit of God has made none.

But the total sum of all these Prejudices, we shall have in one Dilemma; Did not our Saviour instruct his Hearers in all things necessary to Salvation? or have the Evangelists given us an imperfect account of his Doctrine? If the first; then our Saviour was not faithful in the discharge of his Prophetical Office: If the latter; you overthrow the Credit of the Gospel. Well! I hope we may out-live this horned-Argument, for all the terrour of its looks: 1. Christ was faithful in his Prophetical Office; he instructed his Hearers in all things necessary to Salvation: But then there are some great and weighty Doctrines, which it was necessary to the Salvation of the Gentile World to know, wherein the Jewish Church had been sufficiently instructed already. The Doctrine of Atoning God, making Reconciliation for sin, expiating Transgressions, was abundantly clear from their Sacrifices: The Theory of God's justifying a sinner, was evident from thence; they knew what Imputation signified, by the transferring of the guils of the sinner, upon the head of the Sacrifice: And therefore when Christ came, his main business with the Jews, was to convince them, that he was the Messiah promised of old, and typified in their Sacrifices: His Work they knew, all the Question was, Whether he was the Person? Matth. 11. 3. Art thou he that should come? or do we look for another? Joh. 10. 24. If thou beest the Christ, tell us plainly. Christ's Sermons therefore suppose them instructed in the Doctrine

Doctrine of Justification: But when the Apostle Paul, who is called, *The Apostle of the Uncircumcision*, comes to preach and write to the Gentiles, he must be more express; they knew little of God; and nothing at all of a Redeemer, they must be taught their Catechisms; and the first Rudiments of Christianity; and therefore do we find these great Points more explicitly handled in his Discourses, which are more sparingly and more covertly delivered by the Evangelists. 2. The Evangelists have given us a perfect account of Christ's Doctrine; but then the perfectness of that account, is not to be measured by what Christ preached, but by what they were commanded to record and transmit to Posterity. S. John was faithful in giving us a perfect account of Christ's Sermons; but his faithfulness, and the entireness of the account he gives us thereof, is not to be taken from every Miracle Christ wrought, or every Sermon he preach'd; for he omits that whole famous Sermon preach'd by Christ in the Mount, recorded by Matthew. And S. Matthew was also faithful in his account, and yet he omits the excellent Prayer recorded by John, Chap. 17. and yet both of them, and both the other, have conveyed down to us, whatsoever was delivered to them, *ἀπὸ τοῦ ἑξ ἄνω*, from above, Luke 1. What strange work would our Author's Dilemma make amongst the four Evangelists, if it were discharged at them? Did Christ instruct his Hearers in all things necessary to Salvation? or, Was the Evangelist John short in giving us a perfect account of his Doctrine? If the first; then Christ was not faithful in his Prophetical Office: If the latter; then you overthrow the credit of the Gospel. And therefore, unless you can prove every Article of the Christian

Man Faith, from express words, in that *one single Book of his Gospel*; and particularly, *The Doctrine of Imputed Righteousness*, our Author will retain his inveterate prejudices against it. Nay, we may fly a great deal higher; Christ was *faithful in the discharge of his Prophetical Office*, and therefore no doubt, *whenever he preach'd a single Sermon*, he acquainted his Hearers with *all things necessary to Salvation*, and the Evangelists have delivered us a *perfect account of every such Sermon*; and therefore unless you can prove every Article of your Creed, from every single Sermon of Christ, our Author is like Thomas, he will not believe but *upon his own terms*; but will justify his prejudices against it, That the Doctrine is certainly to be found *no-where*, because he finds it *not every-where*. Christ preach'd so much of necessary Truth in every Sermon, as he judg'd necessary; the full account of his preaching must be gathered *from the Yess*: And every Evangelist has registred *so much* of Christ's Miracles, Sermons, and the passages of his Life, as he had *in charge*; and what is omitted *in one*, must be supplied from *others*. And all the Evangelists have delivered *so much* of what Christ taught *the Jews*, as is needful for us to know; and what is further necessary for *Gentiles* to know, is abundantly, and explicitly made up from *other holy Persons*, divinely inspired for that very end. The *whole will of God*, necessary for us to know for salvation, is not *so explicitly* revealed in *any one Book* of the Sacred Oracles, but we have need to receive Information *from the whole*. Nor were the Writings of *any one Prophet, Evangelist or Apostle*, design'd to complete the Canon of our Faith, but *the whole Scripture*. I say not this,

as

as if I at all questioned, much less denied, that the Doctrine of Christ's Righteousness imputed, is laid down by the Evangelists, though some mens prejudices will not permit them to see it, either there, or any-where else; but that it is there, spoken to more implicitly, our Saviour doing *another thing*, & touching upon it *by the way*, as supposing them already instructed in it: And that the Writings of the Apostles, qualified to preach to the Gentiles, by the pouring forth of the Holy Spirit upon them, have more clearly commented upon that, and other important Doctrines, and beaten out that Gold which was before in the Lump; and though of equal weight, yet not so dilated: So that there remains no more just cause of Dispute about these matters, with them who believe the Scriptures to be the Word of God. And as for others, they can never want Objections, whilst their Corruptions and Unbelief continue in full force, strength and power.

But, 5. There is another Prejudice which extremely gravels him; *That in all the New-Testament, there's no such expression as the Righteousness of Christ*: And this (he says) is worth our observing. A Learned Observation it is! but I think the whole New-Testament is but one great expression of the Righteousness of Christ, or else it is but one great blot. However, I am glad that he will own, that the New-Testament mentions the Righteousness of God, the Righteousness of Faith, and the Righteousness which is by the Faith of Jesus Christ. For the Righteousness of Christ, is the Righteousness of that Person who is God. They who crucified Christ, are said to crucifie the Lord of Glory, 1 Cor. 2. 8. and that Blood by which the Church is purchased, is called, the Blood of God,

Al:

Acts 20. 28. that is, the Blood of that Person who is God, though not as God: Thus the Righteousness of Christ, the Righteousness of God, the Righteousness of Faith, are expressions of the same import. They describe the same Righteousness, under various Considerations; being called the Righteousness of God, because it was the Righteousness of him that is God; the Righteousness of Christ, because it was fulfilled in his own Person; and the Righteousness of Faith, because Faith makes Him, and thereby his Righteousness, to become ours. However, we desire to plead for no more of Christ's Righteousness to be imputed to us, than we can evidently prove, was inherent in him, and fulfilled by him: And if after all, our Author be so passionately fond of his Prejudices, he may keep them to himself. But now he will examine these expressions more distinctly.

(1.) For the Righteousness of God: He confesses, That in the New Testament, most commonly it signifies, that Righteousness which God approves, and commands, and which he will accept for the Justification of a sinner. That was well jumbled! God approves, and commands a Righteousness in a Believer, which he will not accept for the Justification of a sinner: That Righteousness which God will accept, he has commanded us to seek in Christ; but that Righteousness which he has commanded us to find in our selves, is not that Righteousness which he will accept for our Justification. Inherent Righteousness, may be called the Righteousness of God, because he commands it, but especially, because he works and creates it: But the true Reason of the expression is, because it is the Righteousness of him who is God, and only discovered by the Wisdom of God, and accepted by God,

God, in the Justification of a believing sinner. But though I agree not with him in the Reason of the Name, let him make the best of it: Now (says he) *this Righteousness consists in a sincere and universal obedience to the Commands of God*: That's Magnificently dictated however. But where may we find this Righteousness? It's contained (says he) *in the Terms of the Gospel*. We are as wise as we were before: Why then we are polled over to Rom. 1. 17. *The Righteousness of God is revealed from Faith to Faith*. Evident it is hence, That the Gospel reveals *this Righteousness* by which we are justified, and is evident, that *the Righteousness of God*, and of Faith, are the same thing, under divers Considerations; but that *the Righteousness of God*, consists in an universal obedience to Commands; or that these are the Terms of Justification, it speaks not one Syllable; only it speaks aloud, that our Author had a very loving Inclination it should be so. Then we are turned over to Matth. 6. 33, *Seek ye first the Kingdom of God, and his Righteousness*. What then? Why; it is called *the Righteousness of God*. It is called! What is called? without all peradventure *the Righteousness of God*, is called *the Righteousness of God*, not only there, but where ever else we meet with the Expression: But what are we the nearer? Why, *this is the same with the Righteousness of his Kingdom*? But what Kingdom? and upon what account? and in what place is *the Righteousness of God*, called *the Righteousness of the Kingdom*? But go on! Now the Kingdom of God signifies, the state of the Gospel. Well, proceed! And *the Righteousness of God*, or of his Kingdom (signifies) that that Righteousness which the Gospel prescribes, which is contained in the Sermons

and

and Parables of Christ: *Ergo, &c. Quid erat Demonstrationum!* Round about our Coal-fire! And now who can be so hard-hearted, as not to allow our Author rarely qualified, to Reform the Religion of Christendom? What man would not be content to be argued out of his Seven Senses, with such potent Demonstration?

(2.) *We must observe farther* (if at least it be farther) *that this Righteousness of God (which he commands and rewards) is the Righteousness of Faith, or Righteousness by the Faith of Christ.* We have heard so: The Gospel commands us to believe in Christ for Justification; for he is our Righteousness. This will not undo us yet: But Faith is often taken objectively, for the Gospel of Christ. Faith is sometimes so used; but that [Faith in Christ] is so used, we wait for evidence. He produces it from *Acts 24. 24.* Felix *fear* for Paul, and heard him concerning the Faith of Christ, that is, concerning Righteousness, Temperance, and the Judgment to come. But here our Author is taken napping. 1. He corrupts both the Original, and the Translation (unless he has other Bibles than are come to our hands) for neither the Greek nor the English say, *He heard him concerning the Faith of Christ:* (which words are more liable to a perverse insinuation,) but, *ὅτι* *ἔσθ' ἡ πίστις*, concerning that Faith which is in, or upon Christ. 2. He prevaricates with his Reader most palpably, in making those words, [concerning Righteousness, Temperance, and Judgment to come] to be an Exegesis of the foregoing words [The Faith that is in Christ:] Whereas the Apostle argued with Felix about the Nature of these things; wherein he knew he was Defective, to awaken his secure and

and *sleepy Conscience*, to consider, what need he had by *Faith to fly to Christ* for a better *Righteousness* than his own. The Apostle took the true Method of Gods Spirit, to insist upon *Righteousness*, to convince him of his *Injustice*, *Bribery*; upon *Temperance* or *Continence*, to convince him of his *Adultery*; and upon *Judgment to come*, to alarm him with the righteous Judgment of God; that so being terrified by the Law, he might more gladly entertain the Doctrine of *Faith in Christ* for *Righteousness*, wherein he might stand before God; which otherwise his proud unhumbl'd heart would never have brook'd, and submitted to.

[3.] His Next step is, towards the deciding the Controversie about the way of Abraham's being justified before God: And a great and weighty Question it is; for Abraham being called, The Father of the Faithful, it might seem strange, that the Father should be justified one way, and his Children another; when Believers are therefore, and only therefore, his Children, because they walk in the steps of his Faith, Rom. 4. 12. And seeing (as our Author Confesses) he was set forth as a Patern of our Justification; It were to be admired, If the Exemplar, and the Copy; the Archetype, and Ectype, were of Divers kinds: It will be of good use therefore to enquire, What way Abraham was justified? Though the best way to resolve it, is to enquire, What way Believers under the Gospel are justified? Now the Apostle is very punctual herein, Rom. 4. 11. Abraham received the sign of Circumcision; a Seal of the Righteousness of Faith, which he had yet being uncircumcised, that he might be the Father of all them that believe, though they be not circumcised, that Righteousness might be imputed to them also.

also. Look what way *Abraham* was justified, the same way are all true Believers justified (for he is Father of the faithful; and they his Children only, because they tread in the steps of the same Faith:) but *Abraham* was justified by Faith, by the Righteousness of Faith, and in a way of Imputation (whatsoever these Expressions signifie;) therefore Believers under the Gospel are justified by Faith, by the Righteousness of Faith, and in a way of Imputation. Again, *Gal. 3: 6. Even as Abraham believed God, and it was accounted to him for Righteousness: v. 7. Know ye therefore, that they which are of Faith, are the Children of faithful Abraham: Where the Apostle demonstrates, that the sameness of a Christian's Faith with Abrahams, is as able to denominate him one of Abraham's Children, as if he came out of his loins. Ver. 9. So them, they which are of Faith, are blessed with faithful Abraham. If they have the same Faith with Abraham, they shall have the same Blessing with Abraham; for says he, v. 13. Christ hath redeemed us from the Curse of the Law, being made a Curse for us; that the Blessing of Abraham might come upon the Gentiles, through Jesus Christ. All the advantage the Gentiles receive by Christ (and they need no more to make them perfectly and eternally blessed) is, that Abraham's Blessing may come upon them: But if we have not Abraham's Faith, we must never expect a part in Abraham's Blessing: Nay (says the Apostle) v. 8. Abraham had the same Gospel preach'd to him, that we have. The Scripture foreseeing (that is, the Spirit of Christ which gave forth the Scripture) that God would justify the Heathen through Faith, preached before the Gospel to Abraham. Now the preaching of the Gospel, is the*

Spirit's Engine; for the begetting a true, living, and lively Faith. If then Abraham had the same Gospel, the same Faith, the same Blessing, with Christians, he was justified the same way; but so had our Father Abraham.

But what is our Author's judgment in the case? I confess that's hard to discover; p. 242. he gives us, *The Righteousness of God, the Righteousness of Faith, and the Righteousness of God, which is by the Faith of Jesus Christ, as Synonymes*. And again expressly, p. 245. he observes it to us for a choice discovery; That the Righteousness of God, is the Righteousness of Faith, or Righteousness by the Faith of Christ. And now p. 246. he is peremptory; That this Righteousness of Faith, and this alone, can recommend us to God: Which (says he) the Apostle proves from the example of Abraham; and adds, That Abraham, who was the Father of the faithful, was set forth for a pattern of our Justification. Now scarce one of his Readers in a thousand, but would have been trying Conclusions out of his premises: *Abraham's Righteousness, was the Righteousness of Faith: But the Righteousness of Faith, is the Righteousness of Faith in Christ; therefore Abraham's Righteousness was the Righteousness of Faith in Christ.* Again (says he) the Apostle proves, that this Righteousness of Faith, and this alone, can recommend us to God. If then there be but one only Righteousness that can recommend us to God; either Abraham and Christians have one and the same Righteousness, or else one of them must needs want a Righteousness that can recommend them to God. But now from these premises, our Author concludes, that Abraham's Faith, was not a Faith in Christ. Then say I, His Righteousness

ness was not the Righteousness by Faith in Christ : And then it was not neither the Righteousness of Faith, no, nor the Righteousness of God ; for our Author has warranted us, p. 243, and 245. That the Righteousness of Faith, the Righteousness of God, and the Righteousness by the Faith of Christ, are but all one Righteousness. But here we have the Quintessence and Elucidation of our Author's rational Abilities : To this purpose he argues, The Father of the faithful, and his believing Children, are justified both one way ; But Abraham the Father of the faithful was justified one way, and therefore Believers, who are his Children, are justified another. Now I like our Author's Conclusions dearly, when they are together by the ears with their premises. Again, Thus he reasons ; Abraham was set forth for a pattern of our Justification : But nothing ought to be like its pattern ; and therefore you may be sure if Abraham was justified one way, Believers are justified another. Again, The Apostle proves what way Believers are justified, from the example of Abraham ; But now the Apostle you know, always argues from one sort of things to another ; his way of concluding is by *analogiam et a maiori* : And therefore, if Abraham was justified by Faith, you may conclude from thence, then Christians are justified by Works ; and if Believers are justified by Faith in Christ, then to be sure Abraham was justified some other way. The plain truth is, our Author is got into a Cramp, and has so hamper'd and bangled his matters, that I am very confident none of his Readers do understand him, and it were well, if he understood himself.

There are two Enquiries he will make to enlighten us in this Mystery.

1. What that Faith was whereby *Abraham* was justified? 2. What Agreement there is between the Faith of *Abraham*, and the Faith in Christ.

(1.) *What that Faith was whereby Abraham was justified?* To which he answers: 1. Negatively, *It was not a Faith in Christ.* Which Determination might have better become any mans mouth than his, whose hand has subscribed the Seventh Article of the Church of England: *Both in the Old-Testament and the New, Everlasting Life is offered to Mankind by Jesus Christ, who is the only Mediator between God and man, being both God and man.* And I do the rather urge him with this Article, because it speaks not only what respect God might have to Christ, in bestowing Eternal Life; but that there was an offer to Mankind of Eternal Life, through Christ, which speaks that respect which Believers had to a Mediator in their Faith. But perhaps these Articles are but matter of course and form, and therefore I shall press him with what has more weight than a sorry Subscription: *The Righteousness of God (says he, p. 245.) is the Righteousness of Faith, or Righteousness by the Faith of Christ: But Abraham's Righteousness, was the Righteousness of God; and therefore it was the Righteousness of Faith, or the Righteousness by the Faith of Jesus Christ: Yea, (says our Author) Christ was the material Object of Abraham's Faith, that is, he believed the promise of God's sending Christ into the World, John 8. 56. Your Father Abraham rejoiced to see my day, and he saw it and was glad.* Hence it's evident, that *Abraham* had a great and personal concern in Christ's coming into

into the World, which made his heart leap within him: The same which the Apostle expresseth, *Rom. 5. 11. We joy in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, through whom we have received the Atonement: For what cause of all this triumph, all this joy, that Christ should come into the World, some thousands of years after he should be dead, and buried, and rotten in his grave, to preach a Gospel in which he had no concern, and for which he should not be one pin the better? But our Author will prove that Abraham's Faith was not a Faith in Christ, because no man could believe in Christ till he came. But I profess my self otherwise perswaded, and that the actual exhibition of Christ in the flesh, was not at all times absolutely necessary to a believing in him. Abraham believed that testimony which God gave of his son, that in him all the Nations of the earth should be blessed: He believed that God would bless him for the sake of Christ. He saw Christ slain from the Foundation of the World in Sacrifices: He saw a Redeemer, as that way which God had chosen to bruise the head of the Serpent; which St. John expounds, 1 Epist. 3. 8. by destroying the works of the Devil; and Paul, Heb. 2. 14. by destroying the Devil, that is, so far as he had got the power of Death into his hands by sin: and in that security which he received from the promise of God, and from Christ, who was the Reason of its being made good, *Tea and Amen*, His Soul did rejoyce with exceeding great joy; for so much *ἡγαλλοῦτο*, and *ἠχάρη* do import. But our Author has a Notion of Believing that is worth two of this, and will do his work: To believe any thing upon the Authority of Christ, is the true Notion of believing in him. To which I answer, 1. Supposing this to be the true*

Notion of believing, yet might Abraham receive a Doctrine upon the Authority of Christ, before his Manifestation in the Flesh: Christ was Mediator before his Incarnation, nor was his Assumption of our Nature absolutely necessary to the discharge of his Prophetical, but of his Priestly Office. A Body was prepared him, that he might have what to offer in Sacrifice to God, Hebr. 10. 7, 8. It was the Spirit of Christ that spake in the Prophets, 1 Pet. 1. 11. and to deny this, is to deny something more than all the Thirty nine Articles, namely, the Nicene Creed, I believe in the Holy Ghost, who spake by the Prophets. But, 2. I deny that to receive a Doctrine upon the Authority of Christ, is the true and full Notion of believing on him: Faith in general implies an assent to a Truth upon the Authority of the Revealer; but to make this a saving, a justifying Faith, the assent of the Understanding must draw along with it the Consent of the Will. A true Faith is described by such terms as include the Concurrent Act both of the Will and the Understanding; and therefore that which the Apostles Creed expresses, I believe the Resurrection of the Body; the Nicene Creed renders, I look for the Resurrection of the Dead: Taking in that Act of the Soul, whereby it waits and stedfastly hopes for the goodness of the thing promised; as well as credits the Veracity of God in the truth of the Proposition. And thus Abraham believed in Christ, he looked and waited for that rich Mercy wrap'd up in that promise of the Messiah, and all those spiritual Blessings that were to come through him. 3. The Reason of the Promise, is the Object of Faith, as well as the Truth of the Promiser. Abraham believed the Promise to be true, upon the Authority of him who gave it forth;

farth; but he saw also that it was upon the account of Christ, a Mediator, that God would communicate to him the Blessings of the Covenant epitomized in that, *I will be thy God*. And this was that Gospel or Glad-tidings which was preached to Abraham, Gal. 3. 8. But our Author threatens we shall hear more of this presently: And I promise him when we do, it shall be fully considered. 2. He answers Affirmatively, *Abraham believed God*. To which I say, *Subordinatio non pugnant*: To believe God, and to believe in Christ, are very well consistent. That Abraham believed in God, and therefore he believed in Christ, seems to me to carry a fair Reason, as that other of his: *Abraham believed God, and therefore he did not believe in Christ*; for the Scripture represents them as well agreed, 1 Pet. 1. 21. *Through Christ we believe in God*.

[4.] Our next Task must be to Combat with our Author's Scruples, and certainly never did man so sinthe with prejudices against Truth: It's hard to conceive how Abraham should learn this Mystery from that general Promise, *[In thy Seed shall all the Nations of the Earth be blessed.]* Prejudice will, I confess, make an easier matter than this very hard, and unbelief, impossible to be conceived: And yet were there not something worse than Prejudice at the bottom, the difficulty could not be insuperable: For, 1. Abraham had one Promise that we know of, to clear up the meaning of this. Several Promises give Reciprocal light to one another: The first Promise assured him, That the Seed of the Woman should bruise the Serpent's head: This shews to Abraham the necessity of having that Enmity removed, which the Devil by sin had sown between God and his Crea-

ture; the removing of *the Enemy* could not be, whilst Satan had the Domination over the Creature; *A Seed* is therefore promised, to heal all that misery which sin brought into the World. This Promise was committed to the Church of God, which was a *faithful Guardian*, to keep *so precious a Jewel* committed to its trust: In this Seed (which God had now revealed should come out of the Loins of Abraham) God promises *Blessedness*, which mutually sends light to the other Promise, that God would not only by the Promised Seed, *Deliver from evil*, but *bestow all good*. 2. *Abraham* might have other and better Comments upon both these Promises, than we are concerned to know; it's enough for us, that we are taught in general, that *Abraham was justified the same way that we are*; and what that is, the New-Testament abundantly declares: And therefore it's more ingenuous to conclude, That *Abraham was justified by a Faith in Christ*, because *we are so*; than, That *we are not justified by the Righteousness of Christ*, because *Abraham was not so*. 3. *Abraham* understood the true use of *Sacrifices*, which are a clear Paraphrase upon the Promise, in what manner God would reconcile the World to himself, namely, by *laying the sins of the Offender upon the head of that Sacrifice*, which in the fulness of time should be offered for a *Propitiation to God*. In the Faith of which grand Propitiation, all true Believers lived and died: And when at length he was exhibited to the World, *John the Baptist* points to him, as the Accomplishment of *all their former Sacrifices*, and the Answer of all their Prayers and Hopes: *This is that Lamb of God, which takes away the sins of the World*, John 1. 29. But, 4. *The Promise*

wise
this
Work
the
in
and
who
selve
of G
not
tongu
out
And,
that
preac
then
way
good
distr
of a
Faith
a Go
An
up m
belie
he su
incre
fore
on of
assur
sing
stun
Bless
I can

wise it self is not so obscure neither, but that upon this single Supposition, That God would bless the World with spiritual Blessings in the promised Seed; they might easily conclude, they could not be blessed in themselves; and therefore not in their own works and deservings, but in the Righteousness of another, who must be more acceptable to God than themselves. 5. We ought to entertain charitable thoughts of God, of his Goodness and Mercy, that he would not preach to Abraham the Gospel in an unknown tongue; that is, would not give him a Promise, without the full latitude and extent of its meaning. And, 6. We are assured of the matter of fact that God did, because he had the same Gospel preached to him, That God would justify the Heathen through Faith, Gal. 3. 8. Now as it's a strange way of Preaching, to speak in a Language not understood; so it's as strange a Gospel that knows no Mediator, no Redeemer. Whatever then was the Object of a Gospel-Faith, was the Object of Abraham's Faith (for substance) and whatever did constitute a Gospel-Righteousness, made up his Righteousness.

And yet after all this, our Author has mustered up more self-created Prejudices, to stumble his own belief of the way of Abraham's Justification: For he supposes, that Abraham must believe many things incredible, and know many things not knowable, before he could come to the knowledge of the Imputation of Christ's Righteousness: As, (1.) He must be well assured, that the Blessings here meant are spiritual Blessings, &c. But if this be the worst on't, it would stumble me more to believe, how he could believe Blessedness, without pardon of sin, and eternal life. I cannot tell whether I shall satistie another, but I have

have satisfied my self in this matter, from these Considerations: 1. That Abraham upon his believing, was justified in the sight of God; and methinks it looks like a mere whimsy, to fancy a Nation of Justification in his sight, that has neither pardon of sin included in it, nor eternal life attending of it. It's strange to me to hear of Justification before God against Temporal Evils: And if Abraham had no other, I think he was never perfectly justified. 2. The Determination of the Church of England is no light matter with us, Artic. 7. They are not to be heard, that feign the Fathers looked only for Transitory Promises. But it seems, that in this one particular, the Church was not infallible; for they are to be heard, and read, and licensed, and advanced too, who dare feign, and write, and preach, That the Patriarchs either looked for none, or at the best but Transitory Promises. 3. When I read, that Abraham was so earnest to see Christ's day by Faith, and when he got a sight of it, he was glad; I begin to think with my self, what should be the ground of so great a joy, at so great a distance. Spiritual Promise he is allowed none; and was it worth the while to rejoyce in the foresight of some temporal Advantage that should come to the Jews, when he should be turn'd to dust and nothing? especially, seeing the coming of Christ either brought spiritual Mercies to the Seed of Abraham, or none at all: So that he had more cause to sit down and lament, that he had no promise of Love from, or Life with God, either for his Person, or Posterity. Ay! but (says he) the Promise was not so clear, but men might mistake it. That may be I confess! And so may the clearest that ever God gave to the sons of men. If men will

by their wits on works, and fetters, and torture, and
 pen, and wrest every letter and syllable, and in all
 this forsake the Conduct of God's Spirit, and scorn
 the Catholick Judgment of the Church in all Ages,
 to gratifie their Airy Crotchets, I do not remember
 a Promise of God to secure them against mistaking
 his Promises, Ay! but (says he) we know that the
 whole Jewish Church did so for many Ages. If he
 knows it, he knows more than I do (but that is no
 great wonder) and than any man alive besides his
 own Knowing-self: And yet they had more particu-
 lar Promises concerning Christ than that was, and yet
 expected only a temporal Prince. I will deal openly
 with him; I do not believe, that the whole Jewish
 Church for any Age, much less for many Ages, no
 not for any one day in any Age, did expect a Messiah
 to deliver them only from temporal evils: That
 there was great degeneracy in that Church in some
 Ages, I deny not (there is so amongst Christians)
 especially towards the latter times of their Church-
 state: But that ever the whole Church so far dege-
 nerated, as to lose the expectation of a Redeemer to
 deliver them from sin and its consequents, and to en-
 dow them with spiritual Blessings, I demand better
 proofs than Confidence, before I subscribe. And,
 1. For Abraham, it's evident he sought a heavenly
 Country; and therefore I conclude, That the be-
 lieving Jews, who had (says our Author) more par-
 ticular Promises concerning Christ, sought a heavenly
 one too; or their more express Promises were ill be-
 stowed on them, Heb. xi. 9. By Faith, he (Abra-
 ham) dwelt in the promised Land, as in a strange
 Country. The promised Land was a strange Coun-
 try to him that sought a heavenly one, whereof
 that

that was but the figure, the rind and bark; for that Promise had greater excellencies underneath, to his discerning Faith: ver. 10. For he looked for a City that had foundations; whose builder and maker is God: Ver. 13. All these died in the Faith—Confessing that they were Strangers and Pilgrims; for they that say such things, declare plainly that they seek a Country. Ver. 16. But now they desire a better, that is, a heavenly Country; therefore God is not ashamed to be called their God. 2. It's evident, that the Messiah was promised, Isa. 53. 4. To bear their sins, and carry their sorrows. Ver. 5. To be wounded for their transgressions, and bruised for their iniquities. Ver. 6. To have all their iniquities laid upon him. Ver. 8. To be stricken for the transgression of God's people. Ver. 10. To have his Soul made an Offering for sin: And now to assert; That the whole Jewish Church expected only a temporal Monarch, is to throw such dirt in the face of God's people, as is very scandalous. 3. If any of them at any time expected temporal Deliverances, temporal Honours, Revenues, &c. from the Messiah, it was ~~not~~ inconsistent uttered with an expectation of better things from him; for the Disciples themselves had been hammering some such conceit in their heads, Acts 1. 6. (perhaps mistaking in the Chronology, and Antedating the Mercy, which in its season they might have reason to expect) and yet, by our Author's good leave, I will be so charitable as to presume they looked for pardon of sin, and eternal life from Christ: Nay, I could name instances nearer home of, those that expect from the Gospel large incomes, and yet we may reasonably believe, have nobler things in their eyes, and would scorn his Atheistical spirit, who would

for the
n, to his
City the
is God
anfeffing
by the
a Coun-
that is
named to
he Meff-
fins, and
for the
Ver. 6
r. 8. In
Ver. 10
and now
xpedi-
dint
dalous
empire
s, &
utter
m; fin-
g from
perhaps
ing the
realon
I will
for pe-
Nay,
that ex-
re mu-
their eye
would
not

for to go his part in Paris, for his share in Paradise,
(2.) He must know, that Christ was to die for our sins,
without which (according to our Doctrine) it's impossi-
ble God should forgive sins, considering the Nature of
his Vindictive Justice to him. Now to untie
this knot in the Bulrush: 1. I question not that
Abraham understood clearly, That God was essen-
tially holy, and that his Rectoral, or Governing Ju-
stice, was founded therein, Gen. 18. 25. *Shall not
the Judge of all the Earth do right?* That it should
be with the righteous, as with the wicked; or with
the wicked as with the righteous, were far from God:
Which Consideration might stagger his Faith about
the pardon of his own sin, and his only relief could
be from the Faith of the Messiah's undertaking with
God: In which he had this satisfaction, that how-
ever he found difficulties in the way of believing,
yet still he gave credit to God, and his Testimony
concerning a Redeemer, leaving the Modes and Cir-
cumstances of the Mediatory Office, as a secret in
God's bosom. 2. I am confident our Author can-
not prove, that Abraham knew nothing of Christ's
death. This I know, he had Sacrifices, which
might sufficiently instruct him in the demerit of sin,
and what the sinner had deserved, and in the necessity
of Compensation to be made to God's Justice; for his
violated Law, and reproached Government: And
whether Abraham might not once open his mouth to
God, to be instructed in their noblest signification
and design, I cannot tell. 3. I do not know of any
absolute necessity, that Abraham should understand
the Circumstances that should lead towards the ful-
filling of the Mediator's work, or in what particular
way God would justify a sinner: It was enough
that

that God had *privily revealed*, that he had made *positive* promise for it by a Mediator. Abraham believed steadfastly, that the means God had chosen were *proportionable to their end*, and the rest was to be left to God. 4. And herein lay much of the *Darkness* that Believers were in: Under the Old-Administration of the Covenant of Grace, they had no so satisfactory an account of the particular manner how the Redeemer should work out their Deliverance; which way he should accomplish the great work of Propitiation; and therefore when *new* guilt, contracted by *new* sin lay upon the Conscience, their faith was staggered, and peace broken, because they had a *dark* Objection against their pardon, from their *sin*; but not so clear a Solution from the promise of the pardon of it; the Promise being encumbered with so many intricacies, that the only refuge was a Retreat to the Faithfulness of God in general: Which yet was no easie work, under the Scruples and Cavils of present guilt, and the accusation of Conscience. Ay! but (says he) it was more than the Apostles understood, till after the Resurrection, though Christ had expressly told them of it. Was it so? Then, 1. They could never know it to the World's end: For if *telling*, and *express* *telling* will not make us know, there's no remedy, we must be content to be ignorant: But this is our Author's humour, to reproach all the World for *Silly* and *Fools* but *himself*, and a few more *Rational* *Heads*. The Jews were all *Fools*, they had more particular Promises than Abraham, and yet they looked only for a temporal Prince: The Apostles they were all *Naturals*, for they had been told, and expressly told of it; and yet understood no more than

the wall. I wonder what could have been done more to make them know it, unless it had been beaten in to their heads with a Beetle. I suppose our Author has got this fancy from some such place, as that Mark 9. 31. *The Son of Man is delivered into the hands of Men, and they shall kill him, and after that he is killed, he shall rise again; but they understood not the saying.* But can we be so vain as once to imagine, that they understood not the *Grammar* of those words? that they knew not the *literal sense* of dying. No! but they had not such clear satisfaction about some of the Consequents of it; Perhaps they had not such a firm and steadfast belief of the truth of it, as might bear up their hearts at an even rate of Tranquillity and Calmness, under their temptations and tryals; they might not improve the Truth, to encourage in a patient waiting for the Resurrection of Christ: And that this was it that pinch'd them is plain. they declare it, Luke 24. 19, 20, 21. *Concerning Jesus of Nazareth—how the chief Priests delivered him to be condemned to death, and crucified him, but we trusted that it had been he, that should have redeemed Israel.* They believed his Crucifixion, but were staggered about his Resurrection: Hereupon Christ rebukes their slowness of heart to believe all that the Prophets had spoken, how Christ ought to suffer, and to enter into his glory, ver. 25, 26. Besides, it's a common Rule, That *verba intellectus implicans affectiones*; words that in their bare sound, only denote the understanding, yet in their true intent and meaning, take in the will and affections: And again, *Negatives are often put for Comparatives*; I will have Mercy, and not Sacrifice, that is, I will have Mercy rather than Sacrifice. So here, They understood

understood not, that is, They understood not so much of it, as such clear Expressions deserved.

(3.) Another great Scruple (for I see there's no end of them) is this, *He must understand the perfect holiness, and innocency of Christ's life*: But that was the least thing of a thousand: He needed no *Eliasi* to explain that; a very *Nullifidian* would have believed, that he whom God had designed to *bless others*, must needs be *perfectly blessed himself*. 'Tis true, had Christ's work been no other than what our Author has *cut out for him*, he might have discharged it, without an absolute sinless Perfection: A Prophet might have revealed the whole will of God, and afterwards confirmed his Doctrine by his death; but to be a Propitiatory Sacrifice, this required that Christ the Antitype, should be *holy, harmless, undefiled, and separated from sinners*: And in this God was *punctual and precise*, under the Law, that the Sacrifice of Atonement should be *without spot, and without blemish*. And thus much Abraham might learn from his own Sacrifices; and had he conceived the least suspicion, that Christ would prove a sinner, it had damped his joy and triumph in the foresight of his day. Ay! but (says he further) *he must understand that he fulfilled all Righteousness, not for himself, but for us*. *Ans. 1.* It's a most wretched and unrighteous way of procedure, to call things clear and evident into question, for the sake of some that are obscure and disputable: It becomes ingenuous persons, to agree to what is clear and certain, leaving them upon their own Basis, and to reduce the doubtful to them. It's plain that Abraham was justified by Faith, his Righteousness, was the Righteousness of Christ: If the measure of his knowledg herein, be

unknown

known to us, yet that he had a knowledge, is not so. If God revealed this to Abraham's Faith, I doubt not but he believed it: That he *did not*, is more than our Author can prove. If he shall attempt it, his Arguments may be considered; in the mean time, his Conceits and Crochets ought not to prejudice the Truth: But if God did not reveal it, Abraham's Faith might *live*, though not be so *vigorous and strong* without it. 2. Abraham might know, that what Christ suffered, he suffered *not for himself*, but *in the stead of those* for whom he suffered; for he saw the *Sacrifices die*, and yet *not for their own sins*. And why he might not conclude, That what a Redeemer did was for others too, I cannot tell. 3. There's many a *sincere and sound Believer*, that understands not all the *Terms of Art* that are used in the *Explication* of the Doctrine of Justification, that perhaps cannot tell you, which *part* of Christ's obedience answers *this*, and which the *other* exigency of the *finer*; and yet believes the *Thing*, that Christ is made to him *Righteousness of God*: He is not so well versed in the *Nomenclature* of the *Schools*, as to call every thing by its proper name, but goes downright to work; he renounces his own *Righteousness*, sees the necessity of a Redeemer to make his peace with God; accepts of life upon God's terms; and leads a holy life suitable to his present mercies, and future hopes; and leaves the rest to the Learned World to wrangle about, who may perhaps dispute themselves gravely and learnedly into Hell, whilst the poor honest man believes his Soul into Glory.

(4.) He must understand the great mystery of the Incarnation of the Son of God. Understand the mystery of the Incarnation? I assure you it's fair if it be

Kk

~ well

well believed! I have not met with many, not with any, that understand the mystery of it: to this day. It's more advisable for our Author, to secure his own Faith in this point, than Abraham's Understanding. Abraham was a Believer, and received his Religion upon the Authority of the Reveler; but our Author will own none but what approves it self to his Reason: and whether the Incarnation of Christ have had that happiness with him, I cannot tell: and therefore to deal plainly with him, I have *some Conjectures* that may weigh against his Prejudices, which incline me to choose Abraham's Faith even in this particular before his own. But however that be, the Scripture assures us, that Abraham was justified the same way that New-Testament-Believers are: One God, one Lord Jesus Christ, one Holy Spirit, yesterday, to day, and the same for ever; and if his poor prejudices must controul divine Revelations, I cannot help it. An Atheist would believe there is a God, but that he cannot get over all Objections; and our Author would believe the Gospel-report, of the way of Abraham's Justification, but that he cannot weather all the Prejudices, which he first creates, and then pleads.

(5.) He must understand the nature of Faith, and of rowling the Soul on Christ for Salvation, and renouncing all Righteousness of his own. *Answer.* I question not but the Father of the Faithful, one so much in the exercise of Faith, understood very well the nature of it, and that he would hardly have lighted his Candle at our Author's Torch; but it's grown the Mode, for junior Understandings to vilifie the grey Heads of the Fathers, and to count them all block heads, that think not to a hairs breadth with them.

them. Abraham knew, that Faith consisted in a firm belief, that what God had promised was true, and that the things of the Promise were exceeding good, and so to him: He gave a full assent and consent to both, with their special Reasons: he embraced the mercy of the Promise with thankfulness, and joy; and credited the veracity of him that made the Promise, with security of mind: and he felt by experience, that quiet, and satisfaction of Soul, that arises from an interest in him that gave, and that Redeemer that was given in the Promise: And if he must be feared for trusting himself on God, and on his Christ, for ought I know he must bear his burden.

[5.] And now conformable to his old awkward humour, our Author will attempt the deciding the Controversie, Which way Abraham was justified, from Heb. 11. And this, I say, is a perverse and awkward way of proceeding, to wave the proper place, Rom. 4. Gal. 3. where the Apostle positively disputes the point, and fix upon one where he disputes it not. Two things he would persuade us to believe him in.

1. That the Apostle in this Chapter discourses of a justifying Faith. To which I answer, That the Apostle does indeed Treat of a Faith that justifies, but not of Faith as it justifies. A justifying Faith has many excellent, and admirable uses, does a Christian noble service, besides that of justifying him before God. It teaches him to trust God in all the ways, and methods of his Providences, to depend on him for all the good things of this life, as well as those of a better: It deals with the Promises of the life that now is, and those of that to come: It encourages us to pray, Give us this day our daily Bread: as well as,

Engage us to his Fatherly love, and care: to wrestle
 vigorously with all the oppositions we meet with in
 the Profession of Christianity: to walk comfortably,
 cheerfully, conscientiously in our particular Callings;
 to despise the things that are seen, which are but tempo-
 ral, in comparison of those which are not seen, and
 are eternal. It taught Abel to offer Sacrifice to God,
 whereby he had the witness that he was righteous, God
 testifying of his gifts. And if our Author can see
 no difference between being made Righteous, and
 having the witness of it in his Conscience, he needs
 a Collyrium which I cannot help him to. It taught
 Enoch also to walk with God: from whence he had
 the same testimony, that he pleased God: The same
 Faith that justified him, procured him a testimony of
 his Justification, but not as it justified him. The
 Direct Act of Faith is one thing, and the Resulting
 Act of Faith another. It taught Noah also to take
 God warning of the approaching Deluge, and to
 prepare an Ark to escape the danger: Whereby he
 condemned the World, and became heir of the Righte-
 ousness which is by Faith: that is, he had more full
 assurance of his Acceptation with God: According to
 a common Rule, *Multa tunc fieri dicuntur quando
 facta esse manifestantur.*

2. He would persuade us into his Nation of a ju-
 stifying Faith: This justifying Faith (says he) is the
 substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things
 not seen. But the Apostle does not here intend to
 give us a strict Definition of a justifying Faith, but
 a Description of its most noble effects. A justifying
 Faith produces these effects, but not at all times, nor
 in all persons justified: it's Faith in its vigour, not
 in

in its essence, that is here described. By this Faith the Elders obtained a good report before men, and their own Consciences; yet was it not this Act of Faith that justified them before God, though it was the same Faith that produced this Act, by which they were justified. Where is therefore he would oblige us, less more by this critical skill in the Greek word, *πιστις* and confident expectation of those things we hope for; and *ἐν Χρῴ*, an Argument of the Being of those things we do not see. For my part I am not much edified, and therefore let him make merry with his own Talents. That which follows will be more for our Information; for he will now speak to the Act, the Object, and the several kinds of Faith. *He says* (1.) For the Act of Faith: It is (as he says) such a firm and steadfast persuasion of the truth of those things that are not evident to sense, as makes us confidently hope for them. But this seems to me to be a hungry description of the Act of justifying Faith. The Scripture has other apprehensions of this matter, which describes the Act of faith by receiving, John 1. 12. To as many as received him, to them he gave power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name. Where, if the Evangelist may be trusted to make his own Exegesis, Receiving of Christ, and, Believing on his name, do mutually interpret each other. It is not enough that the Understanding be engaged in this work, which may be found in the worst of men and Devils; the Will must also conspire with the Understanding. For that which Faith is conversant about, being not only true, but good, there must be an Act of Choice, as well as Knowledge, that the whole man may be employed about it.

(2.) Says he, *The Object of Faith must be an unseen thing: As the Being, or Providence of God, or a Future State, something past or to come, the Creation of the World, or the final Dissolution of it, or the accomplishment of any Promises or Predictions.* I grant indeed, that these things may be called tropically, the Object of our Faith; but as they are things to be obtained; they are more properly the Object of our Hope. But that which Faith primarily eyes, that which is its proper Object, is the reason of its Assent and Consent: And thus God in Christ, through the Promise, is the proper Object of a justifying Faith. The mercies of the Covenant of Grace, are many of them reserved for a future estate, when the Soul shall be better qualified to enjoy them; but Faith respects God actually giving himself in Covenant to be our God, through a Mediator: When we say, we believe Heaven, we believe Life Everlasting, &c. the meaning is only this, we believe God has promised to give Heaven, to give Life Everlasting, through Jesus Christ: I believe such a thing will be; that is, I believe God, who has engaged that such a thing shall be. The Authority of God speaking in the Promise, is the true Reason, and proper Object of Faith, and the things contained in the Promise, as they are such, are not the Object of my Faith properly, but have other powers of the Soul that are concerned about them.

(3.) The different sorts of Faith (says he) result from the different Objects and Motives of it. The Apostle takes notice of two kinds of Faith in this Chapter (Hebr. 11.) and faith in Christ makes a third, which are all the kinds of Faith the Scripture mentions. Now I am afraid I shall grow every day

lets

less in love than other with our Author's Accurate-
ness in Divinity. For 1. What a mad way is this,
to distinguish Faith into its several kinds and sorts,
from the multiplicity of the things that it believes!
for at this rate he could have named not three only,
or three score, but three hundred sorts and kinds of
Faith. The different sorts, or kinds of Faith result
(says he) from the different Objects and Motives of it.
But say I in his sense the Objects and Motives of Faith
are innumerable, and therefore the sorts and kinds
of Faith are innumerable also. The Object of Faith
(says he) must be unseen things: The Being, or Provi-
dence of God, in a Future state, something past or to
come, &c. Now according to this Doctrine we must
believe the Being of God with one sort of Faith, his
Providences with another: the Creation of the World
with one kind of Faith, its Dissolution with another:
Heaven with one kind of Faith, Hell with another;
things past with one kind, things to come with another;
Prophecies with one kind of Faith, Promises with
another: And then for the Motives of Faith, they
are various: The Power of God, the Wisdom of God,
our Experience of God, the Goodness of God: So
when I believe any thing, and take the Power of God
able to accomplish it, for my Motive I believe it with
a Faith of another kind from that whereby I believe
the same thing, and take the goodness of God for my
motive: And now there's a Foundation laid for one
of his plain Demonstrations, that Abraham's Faith
differed toto genere from Paul's: because Abraham
in believing, took his encouragements from the faith-
fulness of him that had promised: and Paul, from
his Abilities to keep what he had committed unto
him: So that I think I have not over-shot my self

in saying, That he may upon these principles, *say*
as many several sorts, and distinct kinds of justifying
Faith, as he can possibly spend in seven years time
and as he grows out of sorts, he may stamp as many
more. 2. I am not satisfied that the Apostle mentions
two, and but just two sorts of justifying Faith in this
Chapter: For the Apostle mentions *one and the same*
Faith; By Faith, *we believe the Worlds were created;*
by Faith, Abel sacrificed; by Faith, *Enoch walked*
with God; by Faith, *the Elders obtained a good re-*
port; by Faith, *Noah took Gods warning;* by Faith,
Sarah conceived; By Faith, *Abraham offered up Isaac,*
&c. But if these Faiths were of several sorts and
kinds, the Apostle could not manage his Argument
with Consistency; nor should he so *insensibly* have
passed from one sort of Faith to another, without
fair warning, that he had no plot upon his Readers
imbecillity. 3. It's full as easie to make *All the sorts*
of Faith appear in the Chapter, as two, if it had
pleased the Painter: For, 1. Here's evidently the
Faith of Christians, vers. 3. Through Faith we un-
derstand, [we Christians] that the Worlds were framed
by the Word of God. 2. There's Enoch's and Abel's
Faith, which our Author allows for a second kind of
Faith. And then, 3. The Faith of Noah, Abraham,
and all the rest, and their's constitutes the third sort
of Faith. 4. Much less am I satisfied, that Faith
in Christ makes a third kind of justifying Faith, dis-
tinct from the other two: Faith is but *one;* the Rea-
son into which our Faith is ultimately resolved, is but
one; the *Means* whereby we believe in God, is but
one; even Jesus Christ, by whom we believe in God.
But the things, the good things propounded in the
Promises are infinite: So that I doubt not when
any

any necessity shall urge him, he can reduce all these three sorts of Faith into one again by Synthesis; or split any one of them into a complex by a Diaphysis.

But now let us look into his three sorts of Faith.

1. *The first* (says he) we may call, *A natural Faith*. I confess he may call things what he pleases, only let him be sure he do not mislead them; the rather, because he has not *Adam's* faculty, to make inspection into their *Natures*. But what is this *natural Faith*? *A belief* (says he) *of the Principles of natural Religion, which is founded in natural Demonstrations, and moral Arguments, as, that God is; and that he is a Rewarder of them that diligently seek him.* But I am still of the same mind, that there is no such thing, (nor ever was) as a Religion of sinners; whereby they can draw nigh to God, and worship him with Acceptance; but what supposes Divine Revelation as the means of Manifestation; and a Redeemer, as the medium of Reconciliation. It is owned, that this is a Principle of all Religion; that God is; and that he is a Rewarder of them that diligently seek him. But there must be somewhat more than this; namely, *Ability and strength from God, that we may diligently seek him, and a Mediator through whom we may seek him, with him, with Acceptance.* But (says he) *This was the Faith of Abel, and Enoch, whereby they pleased God.* Answer. There was *sth* in their Faith; but this was *not* the whole of their Faith. Well! he will prove it; 1. *There's no mention made of the Faith of Abel, and Enoch in the Old-Testament.* A worthy Argument! A non scripto negative, in a matter of Fact! The Old-Testament mentions it *not*, therefore there was no such thing;

thing: this is pure trifling: For though the Old-Testament mentions not expressly their Faith, it mentions their Acceptation with God, which without Faith is impossible to be obtained. And secondly, The New-Testament mentions both their Faith, and their Acceptation: Which Faith was of the same kind with the rest of those eminent Worthies mentioned with them: as is evident from that even Tower of Discourse the Apostle uses: By Faith Abel, by Faith Enoch, by Faith Noah, by Faith Abraham, &c. without any ground of the least suspicion that he leaps from one sort of Faith to another. 2. God (says he) required no more of these good men. *Answer.* But there was something required to make them good men. 3. How can he prove, that God required no more of these good men? God required more of Adam, even Faith, in that first Promise of a Mediator: and how Abel should lose it, or having it, not believe it, and yet be such a good man, is past my skill to conceive. 3. He tells us, p. 26. That God afforded good men the frequent Apparitions of Angels: The first of whom was the Son of God, who, in pre-ordained future incarnation, frequently appeared to the ancient Fathers: And he is not sure either what God revealed to them, or required of them. 4. God required more of Abel, a Sacrifice: and that not merely as a part of his Obedience, but as Propitiatory, which by the blood and the fat, which always accompanied that kind of Sacrifices, is evident. 3. Says he, They had no other particular Revelations of God's will. *Answer.* If they had no other, they had none at all: for natural Demonstrations, are not particular Revelations. 2. Adam had more particular Revelations; and it being a Promise wherein Posterity was concerned

concern
I shall
terity,
crifice
of Nat
in the
the La
bloody
to, or
than it
maistr
of the
with is
that E
nent P
let Ro
of Ghr
frum
Lord
outs j
the A
reale
fire to
corru
there
a por
the W
into
must
bene
Abel
Testa
lation
yet is

concerned as well as himself, and concerned so deeply, I shall not question his fidelity in deriving it to posterity, without proof. 3. Abel had the use of Sacrifices, which suppose Revelation: For what Light of Nature could teach me, that God would delight in the death of his *Creator*, that had not transgressed the Laws of their Creation: Abel's was blood, a bloody Sacrifice; not is God ever the more christened to, or possessor of any Creature by being offered dead, than if it were preserved alive: And if natural Demonstrations, the Light of Nature, was the Foundation of the Practice, it is still obliging; for natural Light, with its Demonstrations, varies not. 4. We are sure, that Enoch had the Spirit of Prophecy, was an eminent Prophet in his days, and therefore had particular Revelations; and amongst many, one Revelation of Christ, Jude, ver. 14. Enoch also, the seventh from Adam, prophesied of these, saying, Behold, the Lord cometh with *ten thousands* of his Saints, to execute judgment upon all, &c. The same with that of the Apostle, 2 Thess. 1. 7. The Lord Jesus shall be revealed from Heaven, with his mighty Angels, in flaming fire to take vengeance, &c. for to Christ is the power of executing vengeance committed, John 9. 27. And therefore I cannot but conclude, That he who had a particular Revelation of Christ's coming to judge the World, had particular ones also, that he should come into the World to redeem it. And now how vain must our Author's Argument needs be, from the silence of the Old Testament, to infer, That Enoch and Abel had no particular Revelations, when the New Testament proves, that Enoch had particular Revelations: And if Enoch had the Revelation, which yet is not mentioned either in the Old Testament or the

the New, but only in this place, how many more might he have, which are drowned in the Gulph of Time, and this last, by special Providence, escaped the common Shipwrack? But, 5. That which abundantly proves, that they had particular Revelations, and Revelations of Christ too, through whom God is a Rewarder of them that diligently seek him, in this: That their Sacrifices in God's Institution of them, and their own Application of them, from the first rise of them, had respect to Christ, who is therefore called, *The Lamb slain from the Foundation of the World*, Rev. 13. 8. Which, without particular Revelation, they could never have understood.

¶ 2. His second sort of justifying Faith, he calls a Faith in God: Which puts me to a stand, Whether he would have us take the former for a justifying Faith or no? If the former were not a Faith in God, how could it justify? If it was, then how comes Faith in God, to constitute a new and distinct kind of justifying Faith? But what is this Faith in God? A belief (says he) of those particular Revelations, which God made to the Fathers of the Old-Testament. From whence it is easie to prove, that every time our Author repeats his Creed, *I believe in God*, we are bound to take him for one of the Fathers of the Old-Testament: If this be a true Definition of Faith in God, all the Saints in the New-Testament are misbelievers. But of this (says he) the Apostle gives us many examples, Noah, Abraham, Sarah, Moses, &c. Perhaps the Reader will wonder why Enoch and Abel should be left out of the Catalogue of the Fathers of the Old-Testament;

but

but he must reflect, and remember, that they are rank'd already in the *Class* of examples for the *general Faith*: And truly, if he had pleased, he might have created a *new sort of Faith* for every *Pair* in the whole Chapter: Thus *Abraham* and *Sarah* would have done well in a *Form* by themselves; nay, to have advanced the *Conceit*, he might have created a *particular kind of Faith*, for every *particular person* of them: Each of them had their *particular Revelations*, and *particular Motives*; *Noah*, believed the *Deluge*; *Abraham*, the *promise of a Son*; and *David*, the *warning that God gave him of his Danger*, &c. Now we are told, that the *object of Faith* is *something to come, or something past*, &c. and that the *different sorts of Faith*, result from the *different Objects and Motives of it*: and therefore it had been easy to have allotted to each of them a *different kind of Faith*: But let us hear him improve his *Notion*. *Noah* (says he) believed *God*, when he *forewarned him of the Deluge*, and in *obedience to him*, provided an *Ark*; and this was *imputed to him for Righteousness*: He became the *Heir of Righteousness*, which is by *Faith*: But I find no such thing in all the *Copies* that I have, that it was *imputed to him for Righteousness*. This I find, that he became *Heir of the Righteousness which is by Faith*: Which two things are more different than any of his three *kinds of Faith*. *Noah* was an *Heir of Righteousness*, that is, he inherited those *advantages*, which come by *Righteousness*; he had the *peaceable fruits of Righteousness*. As a *Son* by being his *Father's Heir*, inherits the *Purchases, Possessions, Honours* of his *Father*: Thus *Noah* by being an *Heir of Righteousness*, enjoyed whatever *Privileges the Promise of God* had *entailed*

entailed upon Righteousness. Noah was a just and
righteous man: The Fruit of Righteousness; which
Righteousness is not Gratuitous materia; but efficiens
viz. It denotes not that Righteousness was the thing
he inherited, but the true Reason why he inherited
those blessings: Righteousness answers not to the Pos-
session, but to the Ancutor; not what, but from where
he inherited. And this is clear from this one Con-
sideration, That Noah was righteous before God,
before that particular Revelation was made to him;
He was not made righteous, because he believed that
particular Revelation; but God made him that parti-
cular Revelation, because he was already righteous.
Gen. 6. 8, 9. Noah found grace in the eyes of the Lord.
Vers. 9. Noah was a just man, and perfect in his Ge-
nerations, and Noah walked with God. Vers. 13. God
said unto Noah, The end of all flesh is come before me.
Ver. 14. Make thee an Ark of Gopher wood. Ver. 17. And
behold I, even I, do bring a Flood upon the Earth.

He proceeds to Abraham: Who in obedience to the divine Revelation, left his Country, went into a strange Land, offered his son Isaac, which seem'd to shew that former promise, In Isaac shall thy Seed be called; i. e. That from Isaac should proceed the numerous Off-spring which God had promised Abraham; and yet he was so well assured of the power and faithfulness of God, that whatever Impossibilities Human Reason suggested, he would neither disobey God's Command, nor distrust his Promise. Now here would arise several Queries: As, 1. Whether then Abraham's Religion was of the right stamp, seeing it would not approve it self to his Reason? and, Whether Abraham's Reason was not Carnal, that suggested Impossibilities against God's Promise? and, Whe-

that our Author (had he been in Abraham's Circum-
 stances) ought not by his own Principles, to have dis-
 obeyed, and disobeyed God both in his Precept and Pro-
 mise, because they did not approve themselves to his
 Reason. 2. It might be enquired, *What inference*
he will make from hence? and that he tells us is,
 That the Faith whereby Abraham, and all good men
 were justified before God, was such a firm belief of
 the Being, and Providence of God, and all the particu-
 lar Revelations God made to them, as made them
 careful to please God in all things. Now this is still
 the Question, and is like so to continue, for any as-
 sistance we are like to have from our Author's Ar-
 guments. But, 3. There is one thing that I shall
 particularly examine, Whether that Promise, Gen.
 21. 12. *In Isaac shall thy Seed be called*, be made
 good in that numerous Off-spring that issued from
 Isaac's loins? Now if any regard might be had to
 the Apostle, he would soon decide the Controversie,
 Rom. 9. 7, 8. *In Isaac shall thy Seed be called*, that
 is, they which are the children of the Flesh, are not
 the children of God; but the children of the Promise,
 are counted for the Seed. See here now the vast dif-
 ference in mens judgments. *In Isaac shall thy Seed*
be called; id est, (says our Author) from Isaac should
 proceed that numerous Off-spring: No, says the Apo-
 stle, *In Isaac shall thy Seed be blessed*; id est, The
 children of the Flesh, are not the children of God; but the
 children of the Promise, are counted for the Seed. Again,
 Rom. 4. 16. *Therefore is [the Promise] is of Faith*,
 that is might be sure to all the seed; not only to that
 which is of the Law, but to that which is of the Faith
 of Abraham, who is the Father of us all. Gal. 3. 29.
And if ye be Christs, then are ye Abrahams Seed, and
Heirs

Heirs according to the Promise, 14. It were easie, by evidence, that what the Apostle speaks of *Abrahams Faith* in offering up his son, related not to the *Act* of it, whereby he was justified, but to the Evidence of his Justification. His third sort of Faith follows,

S. 3. From hence (says he) we learn what Faith in Christ is, which is now imposed to us for Justification. From hence! From whence? If we never learn what faith in Christ is, better than from the Faith of *Abel*, *Enoch*, *Noah*, and *Abraham*, which are the whole Heavens asunder each from other, as he has ordered the matter, we must be content to be ignorant of it till our lives end. For who could learn the special Nature of one thing, from another that differs from it in the kind? But let us give him the hearing! Our faith in Christ must signifie such a stedfast belief of all those Revelations which Christ hath made to the World, as governs our lives and actions. Why so? To make our faith in Christ, answer to the faith of Abraham, and all good men in former Ages; without which, the Apostles Argument from Abraham's being justified by faith, to our Justification by faith, is of no force. There is a necessity then granted, that our faith in Christ and Abraham's, do answer one another, lest the Apostle should be reproach'd with a *Non-sequitur*; Now to perform this, instead of making *Abrahams* to be a faith in Christ, as it really is; he debases faith in Christ, as low as, if not, below the faith of Abraham: He pretends to under-prop the Apostles Argument, but really he undermines it; and whilst he seems to provide an Expedient, that his Reasonings may not

be invalidated, he renders them more than Nuga-
tory. For, 1. How can *faith in Christ*, answer to
the *faith of all those good men in former times*? Abel,
Enoch? when their's was *Faith without Revelations*,
but *faith in Christ* is a *Faith grounded upon Revela-
tions*: The *Motive* of their Faith, was *Natural De-
monstrations*; the *Reason of ours* is *Revelation*: The
Object of our Faith (in his sense) is *Eternal Life*;
but whether they had *any such thing* in their eye,
our Author will not grant; for he that will not
allow *Abraham*, whose Faith was grounded upon
Revelations, to have had *any spiritual Promises*, will
less allow those *poor good men* the priviledg, whose
Faith was *only built upon Natural Demonstrations*.

2. How can *faith in Christ*, answer to the faith of
Abraham? He has laid it down as the bottom of
this Discourse, p. 252. that, *The different sorts of
Faith, results from the different Objects and Motives
of it*: But *Abraham's Faith* had *different Objects and
Motives* from ours, (as he tells us): And therefore
it's of *another nature, sort and kind* than ours; for
so he says expressly, *The Apostle takes notice of two
kinds of Faith, and faith in Christ makes a third*:
Now will it not be hard for the Apostle to maintain
his great Principle, That *Abraham is the Father of
the faithful*, if *Abraham's Faith and theirs differ toto
Genere*? Those things that differ in their *special Na-
ture*, may yet agree in their *common Nature*; but
those things that are of *divers kinds*, wherein shall
they agree? But all this is but a scandal thrown
upon the Apostle, who proves from *Abraham's way
of being justified*, the way of *Christians being ju-
stified*, Rom. 4. As *Abraham* was justified *without
Works*, so are we. Vers. 2. As *Abraham* had a Righte-

imputed to him, even so have we. Vers. 11. *That Righteousness might be imputed to them also*: As Abraham's Righteousness, was a Righteousness of Faith, even so it ours. Vers. 11. *A Seal of the Righteousness of Faith*. As Abraham was justified by free Grace, so are we. V. 5. *To him that worketh not, but believeth in him that justifieth the ungodly*. Thus was his Righteousness, the pattern of ours; his Faith the pattern of ours: And is it not a strange Copy that differs in kind from its Idea? That's a huge way off from *curb* to *to*: As if you should propound a House for your pattern, and draw a Horse to sample it. Once more look into Gal. 3. 8. *The Scripture fore-seeing that God would justify the Heathen through Faith, preach'd before the Gospel to Abraham*: Now if Abraham had not our Faith, what needed he to have our Gospel? The end of preaching the Gospel is to beget Faith; and it was an equivocal Generation, if it begat a Faith of one kind in Abraham, another in Christians: What needed this circumspect Caution of Providence, that Abraham should have the glad tidings of the Gospel preach'd to him, which made him rejoyce and be glad, if a Faith of a lower size would serve his turn for Justification? Again, vers. 13. *That the blessing of Abraham might come upon the Gentiles, through Jesus Christ*. If we have his blessing, surely he had our Faith: Or could Abraham get the blessing without Christ; but Christians no other way, but in Christ? But thus has our Author vindicated the Apostles Reasonings, as if he had secretly design'd (as he openly professes of the Writings of others) to expose them to contempt.

It may be now seasonable to examine his Definition of a Gospel-Faith; viz. *Such a steadfast belief* of

of all those Revelations which Christ hath made to the World, to govern our lives and actions. If this be to define, put but a company of Letters in a bag, shuffle them well together, then shake them out, and they will tumble into as good a Definition as this comes to: But thus did Atoms by dancing in Infinite and Eternal Spaces, juggle one another so long, till at last they produced this beautiful Fabrick of Heaven and Earth. I except against it; 1. Because the whole Priestly Office of Christ is excluded by it; Propitiation, Atonement, Expiation of sin, are shut quite out of all considerations and the Death and Sufferings of Christ of no regard, unless perhaps they may come in by way of Motive, to believe his Doctrine as a Prophet. And if this be his Faith, I must profess, I would not venture my Salvation in his Church, for the hopes of all the good, or fear of all the evil this World can either flatter or affright me with; however I beg Grace from God that I may not. He that has but half a Christ, had as good have no Christ; and he that takes him not wholly into the Definition of his Faith, may as safely leave him wholly out. As half a heart in God's account, is no heart; so half a Saviour in Faith's esteem, is no Saviour. 2. I except against it, because it may be found in Hypocrites: They may so far believe the Revelations of Christ, as to govern their lives and actions, and yet their hearts never be purified by that Faith. 3. It pretends to define Faith, and yet gives us no Genus of it: Faith is such a Belief, as governs our lives and actions; that is, Faith, is Faith that governs our lives and actions: But the Question is, What is that Faith, that will so govern our lives and actions? For it describes not any direct influence

of Faith upon our Justification; but our obedience. And whereas he pretends to assign some differences, that may distinguish it from all other Faith, true or false; yet in plain terms they do nothing less.

1. It's a belief of those Revelations Christ has made to the World. Now unless he can prove, that those Revelations which Christ has made to the World, are essentially distinct from those which God before made to the World; their being revealed by Christ, makes no essential difference: For Christ came in his Father's name, under the New Testament; and the Spirit came in Christ's name, under the Old Testament. All Christ's Revelations, in order to the governing our lives and actions, may be reduced either to Precepts, or Promises: Now though some have been tampering at it, I cannot find that Christ revealed either a new Moral Law, or added any thing to the old: Self-denial, Taking up the Cross, Praying for our Persecutors, &c. were Old-Testament duties, though not met with in New-Testament phrase: As a Rule of obedience, Christ meddled not with it; all he did, was to vindicate it from the corrupt Glosses the Scribes and Pharisees had put upon it. As to Promises, Christ has revealed no other Heaven, no other Glory, no other Salvation; only he has cleared up these, given us more light into them, poured out more Grace, that we might live more in fellowship with God, and hopes of Glory: But this, and much more, will make no essential difference in the Revelation.

2. It's such a Belief, as governs our lives and actions: But such a Belief was Enoch's, Abel's, Noah's, Abraham's; their's govern'd their lives and actions too, and somewhat more; their Hearts and Consciences: This therefore will make no essential difference. 4. I except

except against it, that it mentions not *God as the proper Object of Faith*: For though *Christ, who is God*, be in the Definition, yet not *as God*; there's nothing supposes him to be so; no employment that necessarily requires it should be so assigned to him; only he is allowed *Revelation-work*, which a *mere man*, instructed with *God's Commission*, might have done.

And now once again he will reassume his Argument: *If by the Righteousness of Faith, you understand the Righteousness of Christ apprehended by Faith, and imputed to us; you utterly destroy the Apostle's Argument for our Justification by Faith; for Abraham, and all the good men of old were not justified by such a Faith as this is: They never heard of Christ's Righteousness imputed to us, &c.* Now how does it follow, that because Abraham was justified by such noble and generous Acts of Faith, therefore we shall be justified by *Christ's Righteousness imputed*? But whoever overthrows the Apostle's Argument, I have some things that will overthrow, and utterly overthrow our Author's. 1. That he begs, and most shamefully begs the Question, which I think we must be forced to grant him at last to be rid of him, without any respect to his Argument: For thus we shut our hands, sometimes of those importunate Mendicants, whose strongest Logick, and most prevailing Oratory, is Clamour and Obstinacy: He has hardned himself to say, that Abraham was justified without any respect to the Righteousness of Christ, that he was justified by noble and generous Acts of Faith; and then concludes, That therefore so are we: And all this, to save the credit of the Apostle's Argument. But I should rather go the other way; Believers under the

Gospel are *not* justified without respect to the Righteousness of Christ, therefore neither was Abraham; and let that save the credit of the Apostle's Argument. As he cannot prove that Abraham was accepted of God, without any consideration of Satisfaction made to him by a Redeemer, and therefore ought not to infer, that we are accepted of God without such Consideration; so we can prove that Believers under the Gospel are accepted of God, upon Consideration had of the Satisfaction made to him by a Redeemer, and therefore may infer, that Abraham was accepted upon the same Consideration. 2. His Argument will recoil upon the Engineer: For if by the Righteousness of Faith, you understand a Righteousness of our own obedience, you utterly destroy the Apostle's Argument for our Justification by Faith: for how does it follow, that because Abraham was justified by Faith without Works, that therefore Believers under the Gospel are justified by Works? Again, If there be no reasoning from Faith of one kind, to Faith of another; and that the Apostle understood himself better, than to argue at this weak rate (for which we have our Author's Broad-Scal, p. 257.) And if the faith of Abraham, and our faith in Christ, be of different kinds, and do constitute two distinct sorts of Faith, for which also we have his Word and Warrant, (p. 252.) then let every Reader try the issue, whether our Author have not utterly destroyed the Apostle's Argument, for our Justification by faith in Christ, from Abraham's being justified by Faith; seeing he supposes him to argue from one kind of Faith to another. For at this weak rate he makes him argue; If Abraham were justified by faith without Christ, then Believers under the Gospel are justified by faith in Christ.

Christ. All that I can conclude from this Discourse of our Author is, That he has *owned* the Apostle an old grudge, and has now found a convenient time to pay him home.

He promises us now he will bring his Discourse to a head: Which I am right sorry for, hoping he had been at the foot of it: And yet I am glad it shall be reduced to a head; for hitherto it has been like the Hydra, when one head was lopt off, another, or two more sprung up in the room of it. But I mistake him; He will bring it to a head; it has been hitherto like an obstinate, inveterate Ordema, that scorns ordinary Applications; but now we shall see his Chirurgick faculty, he will bring the undigested Matter to a Head, and then I doubt it will issue out in purulent, offensive stuff: But the head of it is this, *The difference between the faith of Abraham, and the Faith of Christians is this; Abraham believed God, and it was accounted to him for Righteousness; and we believe in Christ, and that's counted to us for Righteousness;* which is a difference without a distinction, and so he has made neither head nor foot of it: For Abraham believed God, but it was by the preaching of the Gospel to him, Gal. 3. 8. The Gospel-Doctrine that was preach'd was this, *In thy Seed shall all the Nations of the Earth be blessed: That Seed was Jesus Christ, ver. 16. To thy Seed, which is Christ.* So that it's as plain as we can desire it, and more plain than the Enemies of the Christian Religion would have it, That Abraham was justified through Faith in Christ; and if Abraham believed in God through Christ, it's certain, that Christians do so also, 1 Pet. 1. 21. *Who through him do believe in God.* Abraham's belief in God, was not exclusive of Christ; our be-

lieving in Christ, is not exclusive of our believing in God: The Objects *mediate* and *ultimate* are the same, and then the Faith is so, if we may take our Author's word for it (which for his own Confirmation we may venture to do;) and then where's the difference? And thus the Reader has all *the head and foot* I can make of this tedious long-winded Argument.

Having thus happily dispatch'd the difference between Abraham's faith, and the faith of Christians, he promises to give us the difference between two or three other things, or between something and nothing; for to acknowledg my ignorance, I cannot tell what. I turn'd to the *Errata*, and there we are bid to read—*Nonsense*. I was in good hopes that had been it; but the difference of the pages soon undeceived me. I shall therefore give the Reader it, as cheap as I had it, in his own words, and that's good both for Buyer and Seller: And the same difference there is between the Righteousness of Faith in a general Notion, as it is applied to Noah, Abraham, and those Worthies of old, and the Righteousness of God by the Faith of Jesus Christ Rom. 3. 22. and that Righteousness which is through the Faith of Christ, the Righteousness of God by Faith, Phil. 3. 9. Now I have guess'd, and guess'd, and almost tired my self with guessing, what those things should be betwix which he pretends the difference: One while it seems to be, Betwix the Righteousness of Faith in a general Notion, as it is applied to Noah, Abraham, and those Worthies of old, on the one party; and, the Righteousness of God, by the Faith of Jesus Christ, &c. on the other party: Another while it seems to be, Betwix the Righteousness of Faith in the general Notion,

on.

on one side; and, *the Righteousness of God by the Faith of Jesus Christ*, on the second; and, *the Righteousness which is through the Faith of Christ*; *the Righteousness of God by Faith*, on the third; and so the difference will be tripartite: Whatever the business is, I shall not trouble my self about it. Of *two Righteousnesses* I have heard; the *one of Faith*, the *other of Works*, according to the *two Covenants* from thence denominated; which do irreconcilably differ, and are as far asunder as the two Poles, which can never meet: Of *two Righteousnesses of Faith* I have not heard till of late; and a happy invention it was for them, whose faith or unbelief would not stoop to Gospel Revelations. But that we may not let our time run waste, I shall a little consider *one of his Scriptures*, and wait with patience, till he shall consider *the other*: That which I fix upon, is *Rom. 3. 20, 21, 22.* *Therefore by the deeds of the Law, shall no flesh be justified in his sight; for by the Law is the knowledge of sin: But now the Righteousness of God without the Law is manifested, being witnessed by the Law, and the Prophets, even the Righteousness of God which is by the Faith of Jesus Christ, unto all, and upon all them that believe, for there is no difference; for all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God: Being justified freely by his Grace, through the Redemption that is in Jesus Christ.* In which words; (1.) I take notice of the Apostles peremptory Conclusion, *By the deeds of the Law shall no flesh be justified in his [Gods] sight.* Now as this Proposition smiles or frowns upon our Author, or his Opponent, so will the whole cause stand or fall on either side. It seems indeed to carry a smart sound of words against his Notions; but he is well enough provided against
 all

all Arguments drawn from *express words* and therefore we must enquire, *What that Law is*, by the deeds whereof no flesh can be justified: If it proves the *Moral Law*, our Author will not deny that he's at least *half undone*; and I find him feelingly aware of that all along. Now to dally no longer with him, nor to put him to a lingering death: The Apostle (who knew his own mind best) has assured me, that by [Law,] he understands the *Moral Law*. 1. It's that Law by which we have the knowledge of sin. His Argument runs thus: By the deeds of that Law by which comes the knowledge of sin, no flesh is justified: But by the *Moral Law* comes the knowledge of sin; therefore by the deeds of the *Moral Law* no flesh is justified. The major is the Apostle's own, in this very place: The minor is his own too, *Rom. 7. 12. I had not known sin, except the Law had said, Thou shalt not covet.* From whence I argue: By that Law which says, *Thou shalt not covet*, comes the knowledge of sin: but that Law which says, *Thou shalt not covet*, is the *Moral Law*; therefore by the *Moral Law* comes the knowledge of sin. The major is the Apostle's own in the place last quoted; the minor needs no other proof, but that a man be able to read the *Ten Commandments*, which is the sum of the *Moral Law*, the Tenth whereof is, *Thou shalt not covet.* But now at what a weak rate must the Apostle argue to please our Author? By the deeds of the *Ceremonial Law* shall no flesh be justified. No: Why not? Why, because by the *Moral Law* is the knowledge of sin. 2. None can doubt of what Law the Apostle speaks, that considers how he draws this great Conclusion out of *vers. 19. That every mouth may be stopped, and all the World become guilty before God, therefore*

by

by the
By the
stopped
shall
must
fore G
shall
clude
Argu
the W
and
Again
violat
from
there
curfor
to sh
of sh
at w
gurne
the
stific
that
and
miry
justifi
has a
from
persu
Cere
Now
the M
Whe
Conf

by the deeds of the Law, &c. His Argument is this; By the deeds of *that* Law by which every mouth is stopped, and all the World become guilty before God, shall no flesh be justified: But by the Moral every mouth is stopped, and all the World become guilty before God; therefore by the deeds of the Moral Law shall no flesh be justified. And this evidently excludes the Ceremonial Law from any Concern in this Argument: For that Law never obliged all, or half the World, and therefore they could not violate it, and therefore not become guilty by it before God. Again, the instances which the Apostle gives of the violation of the Law, shews what Law he excludes from Justification, vers. 13. *With their Tongues they have used deceit.* Vers. 14. *Their mouth is full of cursing and bitterness.* Vers. 15. *Their feet are swift to shed blood,* &c. which are all apparent violations of the Moral Law. But is there never a Creep-hole at which our Author may escape the Apostles Argument? Yes! yes! p. 245. *The great dispute in the Epistle to the Romans is, Whether we must be justified by the Law of Moses, or by the Faith of Christ? that is, Whether the Observation of the External Rites, and Ceremonies of the Law, and an External Conformity of our Actions to the Moral Precepts of it will justify a man before God? &c.* This sorry evasion has all its small pretence, from that ἐξ ἔργων νόμος, *from the deeds*; which our Author would willingly persuade himself, signify nothing but Observation of Ceremonies, and outward Conformity to the Moral Law. Now that the Apostle in this place directly excludes the Moral Law I have proved: All the Question is, Whether he disputes against Justification by external Conformity to its Precepts only; or against Justification

tion by whatever Obedience is, or may be given to the Moral Law by man, under his present Circumstances? And against our Author's conceit herein, I oppose these things: 1. It appears not that ever there was such a Question started amongst any Christians, *Whether Hypocrisie would justify a man before God?* much less was it ever laid down in Thesis, and Dogmatically maintained that it would do so. Many Hypocrites there were then, (there are so now), who may deceive themselves into a Fools Paradise, that Hypocrisie might not condemn and damn them; but none ever so forsaken of common sense, as to think that Hypocrisie would justify, and save them: Many presume to be saved, notwithstanding their sins, but none to be saved for their sins: If any should do so, they deserve to receive their Confutation from Bedlam, rather than the Divinity-Schools. I cannot therefore once imagine, that the Apostle should so operosely handle a subject; that he should rouse up his zeal, and knit all the nerves of his spiritual Reason, to confute what was either no-where, or so thin, and transparent a fallhood; that to recise it, was clearly to confute it. 2. The Deeds or Works of the Law, are the Deeds and Works which the Law commands, which it primarily commands; but the Law never commanded outward Conformity of actions, without inward Conformity of heart to its Precepts: These are not the Deeds of the Law, but such as God abhors; therefore the Deeds of the Law by which no flesh shall be justified, are not external works only. 3. The Deeds of the Law, by which no flesh shall be justified, are the Deeds of every one of God's Laws, the Deeds of every particular Commandment; but the Deeds of one of God's Laws, of one

parti-

particular Commandment, are only internal Deeds; therefore the Apostle disputes not only against external deeds. By *the Law*, is meant the whole Law; but one part of the Law (extensively taken) reaches internal deeds only: As is evident in the Tenth Commandment, *Thou shalt not covet*; but according to our Author's way, the Apostle should have laid down his Doctrine thus, *By the deeds of nine parts of the Law*, shall no flesh living be justified. 4. The Apostle disputes against Justification by such deeds of the Moral Law, as wherein all the World is become guilty: But by the external deeds of the Law all the World is not become guilty; therefore he disputes not against Justification by the external deeds of the Law only. That all the World is not become guilty by the external deeds of the Moral Law, and a failure therein, he proves, Rom. 5. 14. where he shews, *That death reigned over some, who had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression.* 5. Those deeds which David excluded from his Justification, the Apostle excludes from our Justification; for he quotes his Proposition from Psal. 143. 2. and therefore takes it in his sense, or else he could not make use of his Authority: But David excludes all his deeds whatsoever from Justification; *Enter not into judgment with thy servant, for in thy sight shall no man be justified*: He durst not once think of God's entering into judgment with him, upon the account of any thing he had attained: From all which it appears, that the Apostle excludes the Law, the whole Law, and the deeds thereof, all the deeds thereof, from having any concern in the Justification of a sinner in the sight of God. (2.) We may observe hence, That the Apostle opposes the Righteousness of God,

UNCO

unto a Righteousness by the deeds of the Law: But now (says he) the Righteousness of God without the Law is manifested, vers. 21. And as in vers. 20. he says not $\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\gamma\gamma\omega\nu\ \tau\tilde{\omega}\ \nu\omicron\mu\omega$, by the deeds of the Law, but $\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\gamma\gamma\omega\nu\ \nu\omicron\mu\omega$, by the deeds of Law, of a Law, of any Law: So here he says not $\chi\omega\rho\iota\varsigma\ \tau\tilde{\omega}\ \nu\omicron\mu\omega$, without the Law, as if he intended some singular Law, $\tau\tilde{\omega}\ \delta\epsilon\nu\omicron\ \nu\omicron\mu\omega$, but $\chi\omega\rho\iota\varsigma\ \nu\omicron\mu\omega$, without a Law, without any Law: And hence he fully silences and stops the mouth of our Authors Cavil, that by the deeds of the Law is meant only an external Conformity of our Actions to it. But the Apostles words leave no place for ambiguity: For if the Righteousness of God without Law, a Law, any Law, be manifested, then without either Ceremonial, or Moral Law; then also without external, or internal deeds of either: But the Apostle shuts out Law simply and absolutely, The Righteousness of God—without Law is manifested. As this term Law, $\nu\omicron\mu\omega$, is more properly predicated of the Moral, than of the Ceremonial Law; so the deeds of Law, are more properly predicated of internal, than external deeds; and *Analogum per se stans, stat pro famosior, Analogato*. If then (as our Author contends) we are justified by the Moral, though not by the Ceremonial Law, or by internal Conformity to it, though not by external Conformity to it only; then the Apostles Doctrine is true in an improper, or less proper sense, but utterly false in the proper, or more proper sense of the words: For had the words been inverted, they had carried a clearer truth in them; By the deeds, [the internal deeds] of the Law, [the Moral Law] shall all flesh be justified: But now the Righteousness of God with the Law, [the Moral Law,] and its internal as

well

well as external deeds] is manifested. But this is not to interpret the Apostle, but dictate a new Gospel to him. But further: Hence I have just occasion to complain of an unrighteous surmise, with which our Author loads some men, That because they exclude Law, and Law-deeds from Justification in the sight of God, that therefore they exclude it from having any place in their Lives and Conversations. The Apostle, who is a zealous Vindicatour of the interest of the Law, as a Rule of our Obedience; yet we see discharges it wholly from any, from all use, and service in the Justification of a sinner in the sight of God: Therefore he adds, Before God; and the Psalmist, In thy sight; to teach us, That though the Righteousness of God without Law, is manifested, as to the truth of the thing, yet the Righteousness of God is not, cannot be manifested to us, without a sincere obedience to the Law. There's a Justification before God; to this the Law, a Law, any Law, contributes nothing; but there's a Justification before Conscience, before men, and to this a sincere, and evangelically universal obedience contributes much.

(3.) The Apostle assures us, That this Doctrine of his is no new fancy, broached t'other day, and set on foot lately in Gospel-times, but the same way by which all the good men of old were justified, v. 21. It's witnessed by the Law, and the Prophets: Now as to the Prophets testimony, though our Author approves not their Cryptick way of demonstrating, but is all for plain Meridian demonstration; yet they are full that Jesus Christ was the main consideration in the Justification of a sinner from of old, Acts 3. 25, 26. Ye are the Children of the Prophets, and of the Covenant that God made with our Fathers, saying to Abraham,

ham,

ham, And in thy Seed shall all the kindreds of the earth be blessed; unto you first, God having raised up his Son Jesus, sent him to bless you, in turning every one of you from his iniquities. Whence it appears, God's raising up Christ in the World, to bless his people with spiritual blessings, was no more than what he had covenanted with Abraham, and promised to him, even in that very Promise which our Author thinks was fulfilled in the numerous Posterity of Isaac: But now that this Righteousness of God without Law, should be witnessed by Law, this seems strange: Does the Law witness against itself? Is it false to its own interest? But the Law, is God's Law; and when it witnesses to a sinner, it witnesses home; convinces him of the perfect holiness of that God who gave the Law; of the peremptoriness of God, in not abating one jot, or tittle of the Law; of the sinners utter inability to come up to the Demands of the Law, and therefore the utter impossibility of being justified by the Law; of the severity of God's Justice in punishing the violator of his Law, and therefore unless he can find another Righteousness, he must utterly perish. 'Tis true, the Law speaks its old Language still, *Do this and live*, but then it speaks it only to those who are upon a bottom of Innocency; for to a Transgressor its language is, *Cursed is very one that continues not in all things*. (4.) The Apostle acquaints us, what that Righteousness of God is which is manifested, ver. 22. Even the Righteousness of God, which is by the Faith of Christ. Now hence it's evident, that the Righteousness of God, and Righteousness by the Faith of Christ, are both one; and therefore Faith in God, and Faith in Christ, are both one. As is the Righteousness, such

such is the Faith: as is the Faith, such is the Righteousness; which perfectly overthrows that Arbitrary distinction, which our Author had studied for more need: Of Faith in God, and Faith in Christ, on purpose to shut Abraham out of Christ, and by consequence out of Heaven, and to lock him up in the Limbo Patrum.

(3.) The Apostle concludes, *That there's no difference (in point of Justification) all that are sinners by the First, must be justified (if ever they be justified) by the Second Adam: v. 22. The Righteousness of God which is by Faith of Jesus Christ, unto all, and upon all that believe; for there's no difference; for all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God. As all men that ever were, are, or shall be, are sinners; under Condemnation; so all that ever were, are, or shall be righteous in the sight of God, are so by that righteousness which is by Faith of Jesus.* So that every pardoned, accepted, justified sinner must own; that he is justified freely by the Grace of God, through the Redemption that is in Christ.

From these and such-like Scriptures, it is, that Christians ascribe their Justification before God, not to their own good Works, but to the Free Grace of God through Jesus Christ: but our Author has a way of proving his Sentiments worth a thousand of these: *Could men (says he) be reconciled to plain sense, it would need no other Confirmation, but the Natural evidence of naked and simple Truth.* It has been observed of the great Bellarmine (from whom our Author has borrowed some things) that he never comes in with a [*Procul dubio*] but the next words are a *Rapper*: the same I observe in our Author, that when he has done just nothing, he always makes

Mm

The

the loudest cockle. It was a handsome Come-off if you did but mind it: that when he had pester'd us with his prejudices, surfeited us with Arbitrary distinctions, filled our heads with empty Notions, and when we looked to have been attack'd with one of his old, plain, kill-cow demonstrations, he faces about, and pops us off with this: *It needs no other proof than the Natural evidence of simple and naked Truth.*

But now let the Reader take something warm next his heart; let him use his phial of Essence, for our Author is just now a-coming to examine those Texts of Scripture which are abused by these men, to set up the personal Righteousness of Christ, as the only formal Cause of our justification: And must not those Texts of Scripture be miserably abused indeed, that are thus prest in for such a service? What, the personal Righteousness of Christ the formal Cause of our justification? I have heard some say it was the Adoratorious Cause, some the Impulsive Cause, others the Material Cause, and some that it is no Cause; but our Author is the first that ever I heard this expression from. There was once a good Orthodox Bishop, (as Orthodoxy past in that Age) his Name *Dorham*, he has Written many a long page upon this Subject, and he acquaints us with the sense of Protestants; *Lib. 1. Cap. 3. Sect. 1. That the matter of our justification is Christ's Righteousness, and the form is God's Imputing it*; and this way go most of your Systematical Divines: but from hence I learn it's the Mode now-a-days, for these Gentlemen to Confute (that is, to Rail at) those long-winded Authors they never had the patience to read, nor the Brains to understand; but let this pass amongst our Authors Negligences or Ignorances, till I understand better

better where to marshal it. In examining the Texts which they abuse, he will begin and end with Phil. 3. 8, 9. *Yea doubtless, and I account all things loss for the excellency of the Knowledge of Jesus Christ my Lord, for whom I have suffered the loss of all things that I may win Christ, and be found in him not having my own Righteousness which is of the Law, but that which is through the Faith of Christ, the Righteousness which is of God by Faith.* The main Question here will be, What was that Righteousness which the Apostle renounces, from having any place in his justification before God? Upon this one hinge turns all the Controversie betwixt our Author and his Antagonists. They say it was, what-ever inherent Righteousness he had attained or could attain, what-ever Obedience he had performed, or could perform to the Commands of God. Ay but (says our Author) what proof have they for this? he can learn none, but that they take it for granted, that My Righteousness signifies Inherent Righteousness. And really they are to be pitied if not pardoned, that by His own Righteousness, understand his own Righteousness; for if Inherent Righteousness, be not His own Righteousness, it's plain he could have none at all; for an External Conformity of Aliens to the Law alone, is not Righteousness at all, but Hypocrisie, and Unrighteousness; but I shall inform him of some other proofs why they take His own Righteousness for Inherent Righteousness. 1. That which he calls his own Righteousness *τὴν ἑαυτοῦ δικαιοσύνην*, he tells you in the next words, is *τὴν ἐκ νόμου*; that which is from Law, from a Law, from any Law indefinitely: now a Righteousness which is from a Law is such a one as the Law urges, presses upon and pre-

scribes to the Conscience; but that without question is an *Internal Conformity* of soul to the holiness of the Law; but ~~this~~ the Apostle rejects, therefore he rejects *Internal and Inherent Righteousness*. 2. The true Notion of *My Righteousness* is not to be fetcht from some sorry Conjectures, from precarious Hypotheses, which men (when they are in straits) invent to avoid present ruine, but from the stable fixed constant use thereof in Scripture; but so is this expression [*My own Righteousness*] and [*My own, or your own Works*] used in Scripture, viz. for *real sincere Conformity of heart and life to a Law*, therefore so ought we to take it here, till we see cogent Reason to the contrary. That this is the fixed use of the expression in Scripture we shall see, Gen. 30. 33. *My Righteousness shall answer for me in time to come*; which our Author would paraphrase thus, *My Righteousness*, that is, *My Ragnery*, Job 27. 6. *My Righteousness I hold fast, my heart shall not reproach me as long as I live*. *My Righteousness*, that is, (would he say) *My Hypocrisy*, Matth. 5. 18. *That men may see your good works*, that is, in the New Glossary, *Your Compliments*. Dan. 9. 18. *we present not our supplications before thee nor for our Righteousnesses, but for thy great Mercies*. The Prophet in the Name of the Church must be supposed here not to renounce *real Righteousness*, but the *Skeleton of Obedience*: Now had the Apostle designed only to reject his own *Hypocrisy*, he was not so barren in expressions but he could have fitted it with its *Proper Name*. 3. The Apostle expressly renounces both what-ever he had attained before or after his Conversion, viz. 7. *These things that were gain to me, (whilst I was a Pharisee) those I accounted [ἀνυμνασται] loss for*

for Christ: But is that all? No! *Yes doubtless* (v. 8.) and I do (now) account [*by reason*] all things but loss: I have accounted all things attained in my Judaism loss, when I was first convinced: and I do now account all things even my own Righteousness loss, and dung for Christ: and therefore it is to be noted that the Apostle rises higher in his earnestness, v. 8. *Yea doubtless*; q. d. Did I say that I once looked upon all as loss for Christ. I will speak a bolder word than that, I count all but loss, dung, filth, that I may win Christ, and be found in him not having my own Righteousness: and that he speaks of that esteem and value he had of his present Righteousness, is yet further evident from this, that it was in reference to a future day, the day of Judgment, that he might be found in Christ, in that day, not sticking to his own Righteousness. Two things our Author returns to this:

1. *It's a sufficient Answer to say they need not signify so.* I confess for want of a better the Answer may pass: A bad shift is better than None, and half a loaf is better than No-bread: but if a Man had a better, it was the sorriest Answer in the World. I see when men are prest with express Scripture, and yet are resolved (cost what will) to adhere to their own Conclusions, it's adviseable to cast about, to turn their thoughts into all shapes imaginable, to hunt for the extremest possibilities: If a Word, a Phrase, an Expression is but capable of another sense, let it be probable, or improbable, true or false, agreeable to the scope of the place or alien, all is a case, something must be said, that they may not seem to say Nothing: And if they can say it's possible it may be otherwise (as who cannot) though

they do not believe themselves, they hug themselves for their ready wit, and applaud themselves for giving Respondents. A little matter will blow away this dust: Let them show where ever, *My Righteousness*, is otherwise used, and then let them boast of a bare possibility. 2. *My own Righteousness* (says he) *can signify no more than that wherein he placed his Righteousness*. I beg his pardon for that. It signifies more than that wherein he placed his *Righteousness* whilst a Pharisee; and a great deal less than that, wherein he placed Righteousness after Conversion, in order to Justification. But if the Apostle renounced what-ever he placed his *Righteousness* in, then, either he placed it in *Inherent Righteousness*, or not; If not, then how dares our Author place his Righteousness there, where the Apostle durst not? If he did ever place his Righteousness in it, then here he openly declares before the World that he Renounces it: But (says our Author) *what necessity is there to understand this of inherent holiness?* We have shewed you the Necessity before, and shall do hereafter. *An External Righteousness serves most men turns very well*: not so well neither as he may imagine. *And this is the Righteousness by which the Pharisees (and amongst the rest St. Paul whilst he was a Pharisee) expected to be justified*, but stay a while. 1. We have proved that the Apostle not only renounced *that Righteousness what-ever it was that he had whilst a Pharisee*; but that which was *his own* at the time when he made that solemn Renunciation of it: what-ever he had attained, or might possibly attain, all went that he might be found in Christ in the great Day. 2. The Pharisees were generally bad enough in all Conscience,

ence, and he need not make them worse. It's a sin we say to bely the Devil; It doth not appear that the Pharisees expected to be Justified before God, by an external obedience only without sincerity: It was not their Principle, though Hypocrisie (as to many Individuals) might be their Practice. The Case is frequent before our Eyes, a Drunkard, a common Swearer, &c. will tell you they Hope to be saved, *though they are wicked*; but none durst ever assume the Impudence to expect Salvation *because he was wicked*: No, he will repent when he can intend it, and trust to the general grace of God, and some such reserves, which our Modern-Pulpit-Drolery has furnished him withal. 3. As to *Paul* whilst he was a Pharisee (if we take his own word for it when he was gone) he was *no Hypocrite*, he every-where vindicates himself as to that: His Persecuting was his great Crime, in which he professes his sincerity, *Acts 25. 9. I verily thought with myself that I ought to do many things contrary to the Name of Jesus*: and *1 Tim. 1. 13.* he avows he did it *ignorantly*: He durst appeal to his very Enemies how he had lived from a Child, *Act. 25. 4. My manner of life from my youth know all the Jews if they would testify*: and makes a solemn Protestation before the Sanhedrin, *Act. 23. 1. That he had lived in all good Conscience to that very day*: That others of the Pharisees, were Sober, Conscientious men, I do not at all question; and the discourse of *Paul's* Mr. Gamaliel, *Act. 5.* shows that he had a great deal more Religion in him than most of those who to carry on a design rail at them for Hypocrites.

ay, but (says our Author) *what his Righteousness*

was he, *Gal. 3. 7.* Circumcised the eighth day, of the stock of Israel, &c. So that My own Righteousness which is of the Law, is so far from signifying an inherent Righteousness, a vital principle of Holiness, that it only signifies an external Righteousness, which consisted in some external Rites, as Circumcision, and Sacrifices, or external Privileges, as being of the Seed of Abraham, or an external Civility and blamelessness of Conversation. This proceeds upon a double false supposition; 1. That the Apostle renounces nothing but what he had attained whilst he was a Pharisee. 2. That whatsoever he had renounced, *Gal. 3. 7.* did constitute his Pharisaeical Righteousness: For, 1. I must cut him off Circumcision; that was no part of his own Righteousness, a privilege it was, but nothing performed by him, and therefore could not expect Justification by it: unless our Author will grant that he had a piece of the Doctrine of imputing the Obedience of Another to him for Justification. 2. For Sacrifices, the Apostle mentions them not; renounces them not; for he understood too well their use and proper End in the Jewish Church; that they were their visible Gospel, and did lead to Christ (whom now he owned) though then he was ignorant of him. The Conscientious and believing use of Sacrifices might put in for a place in Justifying the Sinner, with better right, than such Obedience to the Moral Law as man was able in his present state to perform. 1. Consider them as mere acts of Obedience, wherein the thing done is not so considerable, as the subjection of the Conscience to the Authority of God the Sovereign Law-giver: which in this Case is most signal, for here is only the will and pleasure of God for the Reason of that costly, and

operose

supererogatory; whereas *Moral duties* are vouched for, by the suffrage of the *Light*, and *Reason of Nature*. 2. Consider them as *instituted* for their peculiar end, the leading and conducting of *Faith* to *Christ*; and so they far exceed and outstrip any thing the *Moral Law* (being become weak through the flesh) could assist the sinner in; for so they are said, actually to procure pardon of sin, actually to make *Atonement* and *reconciliation*, *Lev. 17. 11. I have given you it [the blood] upon the Altar to make an Atonement for your souls, for it is the Blood that maketh an Atonement for the soul, 2 Chron. 29. 24. The Priests killed them [the Sacrifices] and they made reconciliation with their Blood upon the Altar, to make an Atonement for All Israel.* Now let him shew me, where ever *Atonement*, *Reconciliation*, are annexed to the Actual performance of the *Moral Law*. It is true that the *Original design* of the *Moral Law* was *Justification*, but not the *Justification of a Sinner*; but Man being now become *such*, the *Law* is utterly incapable of reaching it's *Primitive end*: and it's as true also that *Sacrifices* upon *their own Account* could not supply that defect, but as directing the sinner to him who is the grand Propitiation, and from whose Death they received all their virtue and efficacy. 3. As to his being of the *Stock of Israel*, of the *Seed of Abraham*, &c. they might expect some favours thence, but that any was so far bewitched as to believe that all of the *Stock of Israel*, and the *Natural Seed of Abraham* should be justified, cannot be proved. 4. For *external Civility*, and *blamelessness of Conversation*: It would have gone a great way in our Authors account at any other time; pag. 384. he asks the question with some heat and briskness,
what

what? live a blameless, innocent, honest, smooth life, and yet live in some sin or other? Paul would have paid for a Righteous person upon his producing the Ticket of a blameless Conversation in that Britain, though in this he is rated at for a Hypocrite, and all this's naught: but what-ever Paul was, or was not whilst a Pharisee, it makes no great matter to the business in hand, seeing he has so freely and openly acknowledged, what-ever was his own Righteousness after Conversion, in the matter of Justification before God.

But to Confirm all this (says our Author) we must observe a double Antithesis in the words. We must? what, whether we can or no? whether it is thus to be observed or no? what if there be but one single Antithesis in them? It's no matter; we must observe a double Antithesis if we will purchase our peace and quiet: I promise you this Antithesis is a very hard word! *Græcum est, non potest intelligi!* And I should as soon chuse to swallow Dr. Jacomb's Conjunction (at which our Author made such a severe face in the beginning of this Section) as this crabbed Antithesis, much more then a Double Antithesis: but what is this Double Antithesis? Why (says he) The Righteousness of the Law is opposed to the Righteousness which is by the Faith of Christ. And my own Righteousness, opposed to the Righteousness of God. There's your double Antithesis! Now (says he) the surest way to understand the meaning of this, is to examine how these phrases are used in Scripture: but in my mind it will be a surer, I am sure a more Rational way, to examine first whether indeed there be such a double Antithesis in the words as he pretends, or whether a single one will not content the

Text?

Text? And the surest way to understand this, is to examine the words themselves. *And he found in him not having my own Righteousness which is of the Law.* But that which is through the Faith of Christ, the Righteousness which is of God by Faith. Now if any one can find a double Antithesis, or in plain English a double Opposition in these words, he must have eyes like a Cat, which some say, can see as well by Night as by Day, or however as well in dark as without light. Not having my own Righteousness which is of the Law. *Μὴ ἔχων τὴν ἑαυτοῦ δικαιοσύνην τὴν ἐκ νόμου.* There's one member of the Antithesis, where the Righteousness which is of the Law, is a plain Exegete (there's another hard-word for you) of my own Righteousness; and not any thing distinct from it: *My own Righteousness which is of the Law;* and then comes the other member of the Antithesis; But that which is through the Faith of Jesus Christ, the Righteousness which is of God by Faith. *ἀλλὰ τὴν διὰ πίστεως Χριστοῦ, τὴν ἐκ Θεοῦ.* where the repetition of the Article *τὴν* (as every hungry Græculist knows) is as much as *videlicet*. The Righteousness by the Faith of Christ, namely, or that is to say, the Righteousness which is of God by Faith: and thus *Beza*, *Non habens meam iustitiam (nempe) qua est ex lege; sed eam que est per fidem Christi (id est) iustitiam [qua est] ex Deo per fidem:* who for a smattering in that Language will not envy our Author? So that nothing could by the Wit, or Ignorance of Man, have been more groundlessly, absurdly, and ridiculously invented, than this double Antithesis. And, 1. Let us observe how ill-favouredly it was contrived. The Text-order is this, *My own Righteousness which is of the Law — That which is through*

the Faith of Christ (even) the Righteousness of God by Faith. Now if any man would needs bring a double Antithesis to do him some special service, it should have been laid between my own Righteousness, and that which is by the Faith of Christ: and then between, That of the Law, and the Righteousness of God by Faith: but on the contrary our Author without any provocation, without any umbrage of a pretence from the Text (like old Jacob crossing his hands) has laid them in satire: My own Righteousness, to the Righteousness of God; and the Righteousness of the Law, to the Righteousness by the Faith of Christ. 2. Supposing all that he can desire, how does this double Antithesis confirm that which he contrived it to confirm, viz. that my own Righteousness signifies an external Righteousness only? It has been an old saying, that one absurdity being granted many more will easily follow. And yet so hard is this Gentleman put to it, that granting him a many absurdities, he cannot make one follow: but yet the Reader shall hear what he would serve out of the double Antithesis.

(1.) The Righteousness of the Law (as you have already heard) is an external Righteousness, which consists in Washings, Purifications, Sacrifices, or an external conformity to the Moral Law: So we have heard indeed once and again affirmed, but never confirmed: The double Antithesis was brought to confirm it, and that must confirm the double Antithesis. I desire therefore once for all to hear where the Righteousness of Law, the Moral Law, is said to consist in External: The Righteousness of the Law is that Righteousness which the Law requireth; but the Law requires an internal Conformity of heart to

our

our outward Actions, and of both to the Law of God; therefore the Righteousness of the Law consists also in an internal Conformity. The Law condemns none that bring *the Righteousness of the Law*, but the Law condemns those that bring *only an external Conformity*. therefore *external Conformity* is not *the Righteousness of the Law*: and from hence we may be abundantly satisfied what was *that Righteousness of his own*, which the Apostle renounces. That which was *his own Righteousness*, that he renounces; but an *internal inherent Righteousness* was *his own Righteousness*, therefore *that* he renounces. The Minor I prove, *The Righteousness of the Law was his own Righteousness* (Not having my own Righteousness that is of the Law) but *the Righteousness of the Law was an inherent internal Righteousness*; therefore his own Righteousness was an *inherent, and internal Righteousness*. The Minor I prove, That which the Law prescribes, and commands is *the Righteousness of the Law*; but that which the Law prescribes and commands, is an *internal and inherent Righteousness*, and therefore the Righteousness of the Law is such a Righteousness. That which God requires, his Law requires; but God requires *Truth in the inward parts*, whether in Ceremonials or Morals; therefore the Law requires the same: And is it not now an unparalleld piece of Non-sence to call that *the Righteousness of the Law*, which both the Law and the Author of it do abhor? External Conformity alone, is so far from being *the Righteousness of the Law*, that it's *the Unrighteousness of the Law*: But hence the Reader will begin to get a glimmering into the true Reason that necessitated our Author to study this device of a double Antithesis,

thesis, viz. that *Paul's Righteousness* which he pronounced, might not seem to be the *Righteousness of the Law* which God required (though not in order to Justification;) for if his own Righteousness be the Righteousness of the Law, and he so peremptorily renounces his own, then he renounces the Righteousness of the Law also; and what that is, the one Consideration is enough to convince us of: That the Law requires an absolute, perfect, entire Conformity of the whole Man to it's demands, and claims, without which no man can expect to be justified by it. And seeing such is the Case with poor impotent Man, that he cannot answer it's demands and claims, he can never reasonably expect it should do him that service: but now see the frailty of our Authors memory, for just above he told us, the *first way to understand the meaning of this*, was to consider how these Phrases are used in Scripture; and yet when he undertakes to give us the true meaning of the Phrase (The Righteousness of the Law) he cannot afford to give us one single Scripture to lead us to the true meaning of it.

(2.) The Righteousness by the Faith of Christ (says he) is an internal Righteousness: Oh but this should have been proved, soundly proved, not begged or borrowed, much less stolen, for it's the main thing in Question; and of all things in the Syllogism, we should not stand to Courtesy for the Conclusion, why (says he) it's call'd being born again, becoming new Creatures, rising again with Christ, &c. Be still proof! proof is wanting! for we think that those expressions do not denote that Righteousness whereby we are constituted Just, in the sight of God; but Holiness, and Sanctification of Nature, which

which
Right
have
tells
World
and
ness
walk
what
to fu
sation
in re
which
we p
prevai
my of
Corm
himse
told u
Wash
Conse
altere
ward
amiss
Right
ty (a
to the
crise:
Rom. 8
Righte
2. If
ness a
the Rig
fication

which the Gospel evidently distinguishes from that Righteousness whereby we are justified; but let him have line enough. Hence (says he) The Apostle tells us, that the Reason why God sent Christ into the World in our Nature, to die as a Sacrifice for our sins, and to confirm the Covenant; was, that the Righteousness of the Law might be fulfilled in us. (N. B.) who walk not after the flesh but after the Spirit. Well! what is that Righteousness of the Law Christ came to fulfil? why (says he) Learnedly from Chrysostom, Δικαιοσύνη, the Righteousness of the Law, that is, τὸ τίλγε, ὁ νόμος, τὰ κατεργάσθαι. That which the Law was designed to work in them; but was too weak to effect it by Reason of the greater power and prevalence of sin; i. e. the inward holiness, and purity of mind, which was represented by those external Ceremonies: Most incomparable! and very like himself! It was but the other side of the leaf, that he told us, that the Righteousness of the Law consisted in Washings, Purifications, Sacrifices, or an external Conformity to the Moral Law; but now the Case is altered, and Δικαιοσύνη is grown νοητότης, inward purity, and holiness of mind. It may not be amiss to call these things over again: 1. If the Righteousness of the Law be only an external Conformity (as he told us just before) then Christ came into the World to fulfil in us only Ceremony, and Hypocrisy: for he tells us just now from the Apostle, Rom. 8. 3, 4, God sent Christ into the world, that the Righteousness of the Law might be fulfilled in us. Or, 2. If the Righteousness of the Law, be inward holiness and purity of mind; then St. Paul who rejects the Righteousness of the Law, in the matter of Justification before God; rejects also inward purity and holiness

holiness of mind for that purpose: but whether we are to believe, pag. 264. or pag. 265: as the *Donist* of the two, I cannot tell, nor am much concern'd at present. 3. If it be true, that the *Righteousness of the Law*, be that inward purity of mind which the Law was design'd to work in us, then what is become of that *Antithesis* which he coyned between the *Righteousness of the Law*, and the *Righteousness by the Faith of Christ*? I am very serious, and desire to be resolv'd; for he tells us here, that the *Righteousness of the Law*, is *καρποδοσια*, i. e. the inward holiness and purity of mind; and then tells us immediately after, that the design of the Gospel is to work that inward holiness and purity: Now why St. Paul should renounce inward holiness (which was the *Righteousness of the Law*) to attain inward purity (which is the *Righteousness of the Gospel*) is to me a Mystery as deep as any of those I have met withal in your Systematical Divines. To shut up this point, *The Righteousness of the Law*, is that which the Law requires; and his friend Dr. *Jobn Comb*, has furnish'd him with such a Syncretism of Learned Men, as may cut his Comb, and spoyle his Crowning over his Adversary. *Significat eam rectitudinem quæ præcipitur in lege*, P. Mart. *Iustitia quam lex exigebat*, Vatab. *Totum quod lex præcipit*, A. Lap. *δικαιοσυνη*, ipsa legis præcepta, Perer. *Iustitia legis, est iustitia quam lex præcipit*, Estius. *Implere justum legis, est totum quod lex præcipit efficere*, Tolet. *Ut justificatio legis, id est, ut iustitia quam lex præscribit & exigit, impleatur*, Stap. *Ut adimpleret opus præceptorum legis*, Vers. Æthiop. *Ut nos impleamus omnia quæ in lege Moïsis, & per se honesta sunt*, Grot. *δικαιοσυνη*, is any thing that God

God hath thought meet to appoint or command his People, Dr. Hammond. And now for to divert his Reader, he has sprung us new garne: but I shall adjourn the Consideration of what immediately follows, that we may not be bewildred and lost in a wood; and shall fall in with him at p. 273. where he reassumes the present Subject. Thus you see (says he) how the Apostle opposes the Righteousness of the Law, and the Righteousness of Faith; not as an Inherent and Personal Righteousness to an Imputed Righteousness; but as an External and Ritual, to an Inherent and Substantial Righteousness; but we have seen no such matter as yet, and do believe we are not like to see it. And the rather because he has thrown in a very suspicious word that would make any one think, that though he sets a good Face upon the Matter, yet he has little confidence in the Truth of his own Notions. The Truth is (says he) The Righteousness of the Law, and of Works, in the New-Testament signifies only an External Righteousness, which cannot please God. Now I began to think thus with my self: Does the Righteousness of the Law signifie one thing in the New-Testament, and another in the Old-Testament? Does it signifie a real Inherent Substantial Righteousness in the Old, and a Ritual External Righteousness in the New? Sincerity in the one, and Hypocrisie and Ceremony in the other? this is very unaccountable! Surely (thought I) when the Apostle argues with Jews, or Judaizing Christians, he speaks in their Dialect, speaks to their Capacity, speaks that he may be understood, speaks *ad idem*. They that had read Ps. 119. 144. The Righteousness of thy Testimonies [of thy Law] is everlasting, would wonder to hear the Apostle

N n

speak

speake against *the Righteousness of the Law*: but alas, he only *equivocated*, and had a *mental Reservation* in his Sleeve, and understood all the while *Ceremony and hypocrisie*: But this is a Riddle, which because our Author has made of *his own Mother-wit*, he is the fittest Man alive to interpret it.

(3) His Second Antithesis is between *my own Righteousness*, and *the Righteousness of God*; and he is considering with himself in *what sense* they are opposed. But *there's no great difficulty in this*, (says he) for *the Apostle himself tells us*, that by his own Righteousness he means the Righteousness of the Law; and by the Righteousness of God, the Righteousness of Faith: and therefore he will give this the gentle wipe, and away: But now he has quite spoiled the Humour of the double Antithesis; for, if by his own Righteousness, he means the Righteousness of the Law, and by the Righteousness of God, the Righteousness of Faith; then there's but one single Antithesis: between *his own Righteousness which is of the Law*, (on the one part) and *the Righteousness by the Faith of Christ, even the Righteousness which is of God by Faith*, (on the other part :) but at these rates he might have given us, a treble, quadruple, sexuple, Antithesis, and have rung as many changes, when his hand was once in, upon two Bells, as others can do upon six. The Apostles Words indeed were clear, very clear, till our Author found it necessary to obscure them, to deprave the Truth, & conciliate some small reverence to errour, to which two Heads I foresaw from the first, his whole Discourse might be reduced. And thus much we are secured of: That the Apostle has repudiated *his own Righteousness* from any concern in justification; and that we may not doubt

doubt what that was, he tells us, 'tis that of the *Law*. What the *Righteousness* of the *Law* signifies is evident, that which always bore that Name; that which the *Law* commands, and prescribes, viz. *An exact Conformity to the Law of God in Spirit, Soul, and Body*, so far as 'tis attainable or not attainable. He assures us next what he owns and adheres to, viz. *The Righteousness of Christ*, which is also called, *The Righteousness of God*. He further acquaints us, how we come to be interessed in this Righteousness, and that is by *Faith*; and that we may not ignorantly or wilfully mistake *Faith* for the *Doctrine of Faith*; he assures us that it's by *Believing*, by which we obtain this Righteousness. Rom. 3. 22. *The Righteousness which is by Faith of Jesus Christ unto all, and upon all them that believe.*

To shut up his learned Exercitation, or scholastical Dissertation, or Diatriba of Antitheses, our Author will favour us with a Reason, nay, with an obvious and the most obvious Reason, why this *Righteousness of the Law* is called *their own Righteousness*; because (forsooth) this Legal Righteousness was a way of their own abusing, not of God's Appointment. Now here he most tallly supposes, that by the *Righteousness of the Law* is only meant a *Righteousness* made up of the Works of the *Ceremonial Law*: but I think something has been offered to dash that fancy out of countenance. I am in haste, and intreat our Author to accept of short answers: 1. God has not appointed a Righteousness made up out of any observances of the Moral Law, to be that Righteousness wherein Sinners shall stand justified before him: If any will demand Justification thereby, God will demand exact and perfect Conformity. If

therefore Sinners will *chuse this way*, 'tis *their own Righteousness*; and it's time to give it a bill of divorce, God has not appointed it. 2. External Washings, External Conformity, &c. were no *Righteousness at all*, much less *the Righteousness of the Law*, that which it required to form a Righteousness; and therefore chuse it, or not chuse it, this is nothing to the purpose: The Apostle renounces *his own Righteousness*, which is *the Righteousness of the Law*. And this is further evident from Rom. 10. 3. (which our Author quotes, but miserably perverts.) *For they being ignorant of Gods Righteousness, and going about to establish their own Righteousness, have not submitted to the Righteousness of God.* Here is then *the same Antithesis* again, between *their own Righteousness*, (that of the Law) and *the Righteousness of God*, (which is by the Faith of Jesus Christ); and the opposition is so direct, and diametrical, that 'twas impossible to establish *their own*, but they must shake off all subjection to *Gods Righteousness*. The Question then will be, Whether we are to be justified by a *Legal*, or an *Evangelical Righteousness*? And to this our Author agrees in words; but his Words intend quite *another thing* from the Truth: For by *the Law* he understands *the Law of Moses*: and let that pass too for once. But then by *the Law of Moses* he understands *only the Ceremonial Law*, though sometimes he is content to take in *External Acts of Conformity to the Moral Law*; and thus by a *Legal Righteousness*, or *the Righteousness of the Law*, he understands one made up of *External Observations only*, wherein the Apostle has clearly determined against him; to whom therefore from his partial Judgment-Seat, I shall

shall appeal, v. 5. 6. For Moses describeth the
 Righteousness of the Law, that the Man that doth these
 things shall live in them; from whence I argue a-
 gainst our Author; That Law whose Righteousness
 Moses describes, the Apostle excludes from hav-
 ing any place in Justification; but it is the Moral Law
 whose Righteousness Moses describes; therefore it
 is the Moral Law, which the Apostle excludes from
 having any place in Justification. The Major is evi-
 dent from the Connexion of the Apostles Words,
 v. 3. ——— They have not submitted themselves to
 the Righteousness of God. v. 4. For Christ is the
 end of the Law for righteousness to every one that be-
 lieveth; for Moses describeth the Righteousness which
 is of the Law, &c. The Minor I prove thus: That
 Law which saith, He that doth these things shall live
 in them, is that Law whose Righteousness Moses
 prescribeth; but it is the Moral Law, which saith,
 He that doth these things shall live in them: there-
 fore it is the Moral Law, whose Righteousness Moses
 describeth. The Major is the Apostles own, v. 5, the
 Minor I prove from Lev. 18. 5. You shall keep
 my Statutes and Judgments, which if a Man do, he
 shall live in them. v. 6. None of you shall approach
 to any that is near of kin to him. 7. The nakedness of
 thy Father or of thy Mother thou shalt not uncover, &c.
 from whence I argue thus: That Law which forbids
 incest, is the Moral Law; but that Law which
 saith, He that doth these things shall live in them, is
 the Law which forbids incest: therefore that Law,
 that saith, He that doth these things shall live in them,
 is the Moral Law. Again I argue thus from Gal. 3.
 10, 11. That Law which hath the Curse annexed
 is for noncontinuance in all things commanded therein,

is the Law which the Apostle excludes from having any place in the Justification of a Sinner; but it is the Moral Law which hath that Curse annexed to it: therefore it is the Moral Law which the Apostle excludes from having any place in the Justification of a Sinner. The Major is evident from the place, v. 10. *As many as are of the Works of the Law are under the Curse; for it is written, Cursed is every one that continues not in all things, which are written in the Book of the Law to do them.* v. 11. *But that no man is justified by the Law in the sight of God is evident.* The Minor I prove from Deut. 27. 26. from whence the Apostle quotes it. *Cursed be he that continueth not in all the Words of the Law to do them.* That Law which forbids making Images, which forbids setting signs by Father or Mother, which forbids removing Land-marks, which forbids causing the Blind to go out of his way, which forbids perverting of judgment, incest, sodomy, is the Law which hath the Curse annexed to it; but it is the Moral Law which forbids all these things: Therefore it is the Moral Law which hath this Curse annexed to it. I cannot foresee what our Author will return to all this, but his old tawdry Answer. That indeed the Apostle does exclude the Moral Law, but that is only with respect to External Obedience, without Internal Conformity: But it's evident that the Apostle excludes the Law it self, and therefore it must be highly impertinent to enquire what Deeds of the Law are excluded, when the Law it self is excluded: But yet for his further Satisfaction, I shall bestow an Argument upon that also.

Those

Those *Acts of Obedience* to which the *Promise of Life* in the *Covenant of Works* originally was most directly made, are excluded from *Justification*: but to inward *acts of Obedience* the *Promise of Life* was most directly made, and therefore inward *acts of Obedience* are excluded from *Justification*. The *Apostle* has secured the *Major*, *Rom. 10. 3, 5, 6.* *They have not submitted themselves to the Righteousness of God: For Moses describeth the Righteousness of the Law, that be that doth these things shall live in them.* The *Minor* is evident, for *God* never made a *Promise of Life* to *External Acts of Obedience*, without inward *Conformity of Soul* to them, and of both to the *Law of God*. Again, Those *Acts*, the want whereof mainly exposes the *Sinner* to the *Curse*, are excluded from *Justification*: but the want of *Internal Acts of Obedience* mainly exposes the *Sinner* to the *Curse*: therefore internal *Acts* are excluded from *Justification*. And the true Reason why these inward *Acts* are excluded from *Justification*, is not because they are not well-pleasing to *God*; but because the case is thus with impotent fallen men, that he cannot reach the ἀνεῖβο δυνάμει τοῦ νόμου, the utmost tittle of what the *Law* requires, & therefore must fall under the severe doom annexed to the violation of the *Law* in the least *punctilio*, unless *God* had provided a better *Righteousness* than that of his own *Obedience*.

After all that has or may be said in the Case, If any one will be so civil and ingenious, as out of his pure good-nature to yield our Author a few small inconsiderable things: As, 1. That there is a double *Antithesis*, where there is but one. And 2. That a man's own *Righteousness* is another thing

than the Righteousness of the Law. 3. That the Righteousness which is by the Faith of Christ, is distinct from the Righteousness of God. 4. That by the Righteousness of the Law, no more is intended, than Ceremony and Hypocrisy. 5. That a mans own Righteousness is so called, not because it is his own, but because he places his Righteousness in it, and 6thly, one poor sorry trifle more, That all he asserts is meer Gospel; grant him but this, and he will prove all the rest with ease: but though I would go a great way to save his longing, yet this is so large a boon, that it deserves mature advice and serious deliberation.

There are yet a few odd things in arrear, some notice whereof I promised to take; and seeing we are a little at leisure, I shall do him justice. And first, let us consider what work he has made with that Text, Rom. 8. 3, 4. For what the Law could not do in that it was weak through the Flesh, God sending his own Son, in the likeness of sinful Flesh, and for sin condemned sin in the Flesh, that the Righteousness of the Law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the Flesh, but after the Spirit. Now our Authors Paraphrase (as well as we can scramble it together from broken fragments, and odd shreds of his Discourse) is thus much. The Ceremonial Law being designed of God to work in the Jews inward holiness, and purity of Mind, which was represented by Circumcision, Washings, Purifications, and Sacrifices; it was found too weak to effect this design, and therefore God sent Christ into the World to die as a Sacrifice for our Sins, to confirm and seal the New Covenant with his Blood; to work in us that Internal Holiness and Purity, which is the Perfection

and

and Accomplishment of the Figurative and Typical Righteousness of the Law: which he gives us in other words, p. 267. What the Law could not do, i. e. govern our Minds and Passions: this God effected by sending Christ into the World to publish the Gospel to us, and to confirm all those great Promises and Threatnings contained in it, with his own Blood. This is indeed a parcel of excellent Divinity, but that it's wholly destitute of truth: For 1. he supposes, That that Law, whose weakness the Apostle assigns as the Reason of Gods sending his Son, was only the Ceremonial Law; the Falshood whereof I shall demonstrate (if that be not too great a word for any mans Mouth besides his own) by and by. 2. He insinuates that the whole of Christs being a Sacrifice for our Sins, lay in confirming the New-Covenant; the Falshood whereof, the next Section will give us direct occasion to evince. 3. He makes the whole buliness of the Ceremonial Law, to represent inward purity, and (perhaps) to effect it: whereas though some of the Ceremonies did represent inward purity; yet the main of their design was to lead to Jesus Christ; and particularly Sacrifices which represented that Atonement and Reconciliation which Christ in due time should make with God on the behalf of Sinners. Col. 2. 17. *The Law had a shadow of good things to come, but the Body is of Christs*. 4. He scandalously charges it upon God, that he appointed a means to an end; which was found too weak to reach his End: As if God must try conclusions, and make experiments; before he could be certain whether his design would take, and his appointments reach their End. 5. He renders Christs Coming into the World unnecessary;

—ry;

ry: for what though the Ceremonial Law could not effect that inward Purity, yet I hope God had means to effect it, unless he will say all the World till Christ's Coming were *whited Walls, and painted Sepulchres*: For what was become of the Moral Law all this while? had it no power to effect that End? 6. He tells us p. 269. *That the Reason why the Law of Moses was abrogated, was because it could not make men good*: But then the Moral Law was either able to make men good, or it was not; If it was not, why was not *that abrogated also*? If it was able, and had its effect, then what need of Christ to come into the World to effect that which the Moral Law was able to effect without him? But the true Reason why the Ceremonial Law is expired, is because the Lord Jesus Christ has answered and fulfilled all that is represented, When the Sun is risen, the Shadows fly away; there was no formal abrogation either made or necessary to be made; it expired of course when Christ had made good what ever the Ceremonies had exhibited to their Faith. 7. He tells that *Christ came to work in us that inward Purity*, represented by the Ceremonial Law: but for all his good-morrow, when he is thoroughly catechised: *Christ's working is no more than those sufficient arguments and motives, to excite their own wits, whereby they might work it themselves*; and I cannot tell whether he will deny that the Jews had sufficient motives, and arguments for that end under their Law. 8. He contradicts himself (which is no news); for whereas he had said p. 265. *That the Law was designed to work in them inward purity*: He says p. 269. *That the Law nursed them up in a ritual, and external Religion,*

And taught them to serve God in the Letter, by Circumcision, and Sacrifices, or an external Conformity to the Letter of the Law. And then I hope God could not justly blame them, much less damn them for being Hypocrites, if they did as well as, and no better, than his own Law taught them: Nay he adds, That the Gospel of Christ alone teaches us to worship God with the Spirit, and to offer a reasonable Sacrifice to him. This is strange Doctrine! but it's less matter for that if it be but true. But was not God always a Spirit, and did he not always teach his People to worship him with their Spirits? How often does God complain that they drew nigh him with their Lips, when their Hearts were far from him? which he could not well do, if he taught them no better: It's a Riddle to me that these Ceremonies should represent inward purity, and yet not teach it, when they had no way to teach that Purity, but by representing it. 'Tis true, the Gospel teaches us to worship God in the Spirit, in opposition to Ceremonies; but God always taught his People to worship him with their Spirits in opposition to Hypocrisy. Psal. 51. 8. Thou desirest truth in the inward parts. Did God institute a Law, a Law so chargeable and burdensome, and all to teach his People to worship like Parrots, to mumble over their Mattens, and like Puppets to make an outward noise, without a rational Principle to guide it? If they had no reasonable Service, why were they reasonable Creatures? But a little more reverence of the Divine Majesty would confute a great deal of such blasphemy. Let us now seriously consider the Text: and 1. It will be necessary to enquire what that Law is, whose weakness the Apostle assigns as the

the reason of God's sending his own Son? And for all the Authors presumptions, I am well satisfied it was not the Ceremonial Law: for what if the Ceremonial had proved weak? what if it had been resolved into its first nothing, the Moral stood still where it always did? and what need of Christ's Coming into the World upon that account? There was a time when the Ceremonial Law was not created, and what if it had been again repealed and annihilated, things had been but in statu quo: But that the Law here mentioned is the Moral Law, the Connexion of the Apostle's Words, his Premises out of which he draws his Conclusion, will abundantly manifest. In Chap. 7. v. 7, He tells us he had not known sin except the Law had said, Thou shalt not covet: But sin taking occasion from that Law, wrought in him all manner of Concupiscence, v. 8. Nevertheless he clears the Law. v. 12. The Commandment was holy and just, and good; had an intrinsic goodness, righteousness in it; and this he calls v. 25. The Law of God. Now the Apostle having said v. 10. That this Commandment (of the Moral Law) which was unto life in (God's Original Institution) he found to be unto death: Nevertheless, Chap. 8. v. 1. he assures us, That there is no Condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus; and he shews how Sinners are brought from under that Condemnation, v. 3. What the Law could not do in that it was weak through the Flesh, God sending his own Son, &c. τὸ ἰδίον υἱὸν τοῦ νόμου; That impossible thing of the Law: where the Apostle adding the Article [τῆς] intimates that, he spake of that Law whereof he had made mention before, which was the Moral Law; that Law which saith Thou shalt

not

no cover; that Law which is *holy, just, good*; that Law, which is eminently *the Law of God*, and not that which carries the name of *the Law of Moses*. (2.) But what was that ἀδύνατον τῷ νόμῳ; *the impossible thing of this Law*? There are many things that this Law cannot do: It can lay a Command upon the Creature, but it cannot give strength to obey the Command; it can offer the Promises of Life to the obedient, and shake the Threatning over the Conscience of the Rebellious; but meeting with *depraved Nature*, it cannot redintegrate lapsed Nature; it can wound, but it cannot heal; it can condemn, but it cannot absolve a Sinner: But yet there seems to be some one thing which above all other impossibles, is absolutely impossible for this Law to do for man; and that is to *justify him before God*: For so he had said, and proved Chap. 3. 20. *By the Deeds of that Law shall no Flesh be justified in his Sight*. But (3.) How comes the Law to be so weak? for certainly it had once such a Power in its primitive appointment, and was fitted to give life to the Obedient; for we must not dare to think, that the Wise God ever appointed a Law or the meanest thing in the World, but it was fitted to reach all those Ends which in his Holy and Secret Counsel he designed it to: How then comes *this Law, the Moral Law*, to be so weak? If any of the Sons of Adam can produce an Obedience every way such as the Law demands, it is able to give Life Eternal still: The Apostle answers us, *It's weak through the Flesh*: it was not made weak, but became weak through our weakness. The Law is as strong to reward still, if we were but as strong to obey as ever. But (4.) How did Christ remedy, and help us in this desperate Case? for if we

we cannot live by the Law, we must die by the Law. The Apostle resolves us, God sent his Son in the likeness of sinful Flesh, (and in the truth of humane Flesh) and for sin, condemned sin in the Flesh: *ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτίας*; That is, as an offering for Sin: So near is the relation between the Sacrifice and the Sin that is laid upon it, that they are called the same. 2 Cor. 5. 21. Christ was made sin: that is, he was made an Offering for sin. For so 'tis express, Isa. 53. 10. When thou shalt make his Soul an offering for sin. The Greek therefore, *ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτίας*, does but imitate the Hebrew, *עֲוֹן*, which signifies both the Sin, and the Sin-Offering: thus then Christ supplied the Law's weakness: he who knew no sin, was made sin, and as he was made sin for us, so are we made the Righteousness of God in him. Christ could no otherwise be a Sinner, but by imputation, nor we otherwise Righteous than by the Imputation of his Righteousness. As the Offenders guilt under the Law could not otherwise be laid upon the head of the Typical Sacrifice, but by God's Imputing it; so neither could our Sin otherwise lye upon the Head of Christ, but by his own voluntary Susception, and thereupon God's Righteous Imputation; but these things we shall meet with professedly in the next Section.

There is a Metaphorical expression still behind, which our Author cannot digest; whereupon when he has thrown away a little, and truly but a little wit, he will ease us of the tediousness of this Discourse. The expression which sticks so hard with him is that of the Apostle, Ephes. 3. 8. The unsearchable Riches of Christ. Now though at another time, I would try 'a fair fall with him, whether this

this (their
on or
mend
is mo
Grace
of all
the I
weary
Wax
this w
these
it, th
yet b
mong
the w
Gospel
it is n
upon
son of
his Li
Cause
in for
preach
Know
Riches
and de
and th
they a
shen
This
nary N
thoug
cinefne

this (and many others which he thinks it enough for their reproach to call so) be a *Metaphorical Expression* or no; yet I have not leisure at present to attend that Service: for my part, I think that *riches* is more properly, and literally predicated of *that Grace*, that is treasured up in the Lord Jesus, than of all *that paltry trash* which has got the vogue in the Dialect of deluded Worldlings; but I am weary, and shall therefore only make a defensive War of it. What is then this ἀνεξίτηλος πλεον, this *unsearchable Riches* of Christ? Why, even here these Men cannot agree, for some are zealous for it, that (what-ever is meant by *unsearchable Riches*;) yet by Christ is meant *Christ himself*; others, (amongst whom our Author professes his Name) by the *unsearchable Riches* of Christ, understand the *Gospel* which St. Paul preached to the Gentiles: And it is not a small thing (that he should stand so stiffly upon it) for us to entreat; 1. That the Glorious Person of Christ, his Offices, his Natures, his Obedience, his Life, his Death, with their proper Springs and Causes, their special ends and designs, might come in for a good share of the Gospel? But 2. The Gospel preached is the opening of the Treasures of Wisdom, Knowledge, and Grace that are in Christ. Those Riches are, or were *unsearchable*, as they lay hid and deep in the Counsels and Purposes of the Father and the Son; so far as they are revealed in the Gospel, they are not *unsearchable*. But what is meant by *Riches*? why, *Riches* (says he) signify only an abundance. This 'tis to be wise above the common sort of ordinary Mortals; most men I dare say, have hitherto thought that *Riches* carry in their first Notion, *preciousness* as well as *plenty*: A handful of Gold is more truly

truly Riches, than a *heap of Pebbles*; but then what are *unsearchable Riches*? why, they are so called, because the Gospel is not a narrow and stinted thing, is not confined to a particular nation, as the Law was, but is offered to all mankind, &c. I shall not cope with him in his Grammatical skill, for therein he is unmatched: but ἀνεξετάστον has formerly signified that which cannot be traced, that whereof we have no foot-steps: and such are the Riches of Christ, such the Counsels of God, to reconcile the World to himself, by his dear Son; A Mystery whose knowledge depends upon Divine Revelation, whereof we have not the least track in nature, no more than of a Ship in the Sea, an Eagle in the Air, or a Serpent upon a Rock: The Light of Nature is Dark, the Tongue of the Creature Dumb, the Book of the Creation, a great Blank; and he alone that was from eternity in the Bosom of the Father, whose Name is Wonderful Counsellor, was able to reveal and give us notice of them.

One small brush at Mr. Brookes will conclude this Section, for 'tis impossible for our Author to conclude without reviling; and what evil has this good Man done? Oh he has spoken a little too prodigally in commendation of Christ, and it's a standing rule, that whoever will give our Saviour one good Word, shall purchase two bad ones at our Author's Hands for his pains. Now Mr. Brookes (you must know) had said, thinking no man no harm I dare say; That Christ is generally rich, rich in Houses, Lands, in Gold, Silver, in all Temporals as well in Spirituals; with many more friendly expressions of the Fulness and Preciousness of the Grace that is in Christ: To which our Author returns a solid though

though short Confutation: That the Son of Man had not a place whereon to lay his head: And is not Mr. Brooks a rash and unadvised Man think you; to rant it so high in extolling his Riches, and to ascribe to him such vast revenues and possessions: But let us be Charitable, and put a favourable construction upon these dangerous words; perhaps, they are not so rank poyson as they seem to be: 1. What if Mr. Brooks speaks not of what Christ was when he appeared in the form of a Servant; but what he now is since he has reassumed his original Glory, and as Mediator has all power in Heaven and Earth put into his hands; and methinks, it is no such flagitious Crime to assert that Christ has the disposal of all inward things for the good of his Church: But I correct my self when I remember my Author has told us, p. 162. That Christ has left the visible and external Conduct and Government of the Church to Bishops and Pastors; and therefore it may be presumed also he has left the visible Revenues, and Temporalities to their disposal also; for it's equitable, that the Maintenance should go along with the work, and therefore those Houses and Lands, the Palaces, the Tithes, the Glebe, the Gold, the Silver, which Mr. B. fancies are in Christ's hands, are entrusted where they shall be converted to better uses. 2. What if Christ for a season that he might feel our Infirmities, and accommodate himself to that dispensation under which his wonderful Condescension had put him, did waive the use of many things he had a Right to: Yet 1. He had κτῆσις the Title, when he forbore χρῆσις the Use of those things. 2. He used his Right too for others, when he would not assert it for himself. He was Rich even then, when he for our

*sake, he became poor, 2. Cor. 8. 9. Π' ὧν ἐνέ-
χουε, πλεονεξίας ὧν; let him not be reproached for
his Love; pardon him that wrong! 3. That
Christ had not where to lay his head; signifies no
more than that he had no fixed habitation at all
times, but generally went up and down doing good,
healing all manner of Diseases, Preaching the ever-
lasting Gospel: for he had a House to hide his head
in, Job. 1. 39. They came and saw where he dwelt:
and a Pillow too to lay his head on, Mark. 4. 38.
and could sleep securely in the midst of the Storm: he
wanted not conveniences for his life, but was so
swallowed up of his Fathers work, that he account-
ed it his Meat and Drink to do his will; and therefore
I hope Mr. B. will out-live this assault and batte-
ry many a fair day. And now all that I can in-
struct my self or my Reader in from this Discourse
is, That if Mr. Brooks or any of his Brethren shall
assert the plainest Truth that ever the Sun shone upon,
our Author by the Laws of his Society is bound to
oppose it.*

SECT. 3.

SECT. 3.

*Concerning the Nature of our Union to Christ,
Whereby, we are entituled to all his fulness,
Righteousness, &c.*

WHEN the Arm is in danger of being lost by a Gangren, it were unreasonable Diligence to attend the Cure of a Cut-finger. When that Vessel in which all our common Concerns are imbarqued is ready to sink, it would be unpardonable folly in the Passengers to study the security of their particular Cabbins: like those whom the great Orator laughs at, for presuming their Gardens, Orchards, and private Walks would be indemnified in the general Ruin of the City. In this Section our Author lays his Axe to the Root of the Christian Religion leaving therefore particular persons to shift for themselves, The Righteousness of Christ's Life, and the Sacrifice of his Death, with that influence that they have upon our acceptance with God, call for defence. Many have been infamous for horrid Murders: Cain is upon Record for a Fratricide, Saul for a Suicide, Herod's Ambition was to have been a Deicide; but this last Age seems to have out-done all in an Attempt to Murder the Death of Christ it self: As if, because Christ by his Death had destroyed him so it had the power of Death, these Men would avenge the Devils Quarrel, and become his second, hoping they may one day triumph over it and sing, O Death,

we will be thy Death! In Pag. 320. Our Author propounds this great Question: *What Influence the Sacrifice of Christ's Death, and the Righteousness of his Life, have upon our acceptance with God?* And he gives us both a Reason, why he moves the Question, and an Answer to it. 1. The Reason why he moves this Question upon it, *Left any should suspect that his Design is to lessen the Grace of God, or to disparage the Merits, and Righteousness of Christ.* Now I would make a question upon it, Whether his Answer to the Question will probably heal us of our suspicions, or rather beget Jealousies where there were none, and heighten those already conceived into violent presumptions, if not plain demonstrations, that such is his Design? 2. His Answer to the Question is this: *All that I can find in Scripture about this is: That to this we owe the Covenant of Grace: That God being well pleased with the Obedience of Christ's Life, and the Sacrifice of his Death for his sake entered into a New Covenant with Mankind, wherein he promises Pardon of sin, and Eternal Life to those who believe, and obey the Gospel.* This Answer contains three things: 1. A Description of the Covenant of Grace. 2. An Assertion that this Covenant is owing to the Sacrifice of Christ's Death, and the Righteousness of his Life. 3. a Supposition, that the Righteousness and Sacrifice of Christ, has no other Influence upon our Acceptance with God, but that for his sake he entered into such a Covenant (as he has here described) with Mankind.

(1.) His Description of the Covenant is this: *A promise of the Pardon of sin, and Eternal Life to those who believe and obey the Gospel.* A Description so liable to exceptions, that it describes neither

the whole of the Covenant, nor a New-Covenant, nor (upon the matter) any Covenant at all.

¶ 6. 1. This Description gives us little, very little of the true Covenant of Grace: for (1.) though he thinks to put us off with a promise of Pardon, and Life to those who believe and obey; the true Covenant of Grace has given us a Promise of that Faith, whereby we may believe, and of that New-heart whereby we are enabled to obey the Gospel. And first we have a Promise of the right Faith made to us in the true Covenant, Joh. 6. 37. All that the Father giveth me shall come to me, and him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out, Eph. 2. 8. By Grace ye are saved through Faith, and that not of your selves, it is the gift of God. And lest it should be Answered, that Faith is indeed God's gift as all other things are, wherein the Common Providence of God concurs with Humane industry; The Apostle, as if aware of such a petty Answer, has laid in a Reply ready, ch. 1. v. 19. That they who believe, do so by the exceeding greatness of God's power, even according to the working of his Mighty power, which he wrought in Christ when he raised him from the dead. Secondly, we have a direct, and express Promise too of that New-heart from which we give to God New-obedience; nay, of that New-obedience it self, which proceeds from the New-heart, or renewed Nature: Ezek. 36. A new heart also will I give you, and a new Spirit will I put within you; and I will take away the heart of Stone out of your Flesh, and will give you a heart of Flesh: (there's the new Heart.) and v. 27. I will put my Spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my Statutes, and ye shall keep my Judgments and

do them: there is new obedience) thus also, Heb. 8. 10. *This is the Covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, saith the Lord, I will put my Laws into their minds, and write them in their hearts &c. wherein it's easy to observe:* 1. That this New-Covenant was founded upon God's free Grace, v. 9. They continued not in my Covenant (the old Covenant) and I regarded them not saith the Lord: They were a Covenant-breaking people, deserved utter rejection, yet God will make another, a better, a New-Covenant with them. 2. That the promises of this Covenant were purely Spiritual: writing his Laws in their minds and hearts. 3. The parties Covenanting, God and his Israel: not all and every individual Son of Adam: But (2.) This Description gives us very little of the true Covenant of Grace; there's a Promise of Pardon and Life to them who believe and obey; but perseverance in Faith and Obedience, is left to the desultory and lubricious power of free-will: whereas in the true Covenant of Grace, there's an undertaking that the Covenant shall be immutable, both on God's part and the Believers, Jer. 32. 38, 40. *They shall be my people and I will be their God: and I will make an everlasting Covenant with them, that I will not turn away from them to do them good; but I will put my fear in their hearts that they shall not depart from me.* There are but two things that we can possibly imagine should make the Covenant fall short of perpetuity, either God's turning away from his people, or (which is only to be suspected) their turning away from their God: Against both of these God has made sufficient Provision: 1. God has promised that he will not turn away from them to do them good. 2. He

2. He has promised that *they shall not depart from him*, and to fix and determine their backsliding Natures, he has promised to *put his fear into their hearts*, which is the great preservative against Apostacy.

§. 2. As it describes not the whole of the Covenant, so it describes not the Nature of a New Covenant. The Gospel-Covenant may be called a New Covenant, either in opposition to the Old Covenant of Works; or the old Administration of the Covenant of Grace: Now, 1. This Covenant which he has here described is *no new Covenant* in opposition to the Old Covenant of works. The Covenant which God made with Adam promised Life upon condition of Obedience; Now the Commands which God gave to Adam, were as easy as those which are now given to all Mankind: and much easier too, if we consider, first That he had more natural strength to obey and keep them, and as for supernatural strength, our Author will allow us none, unless by a desperate Catachresis we will call Moral Arguments so; which to a Creature dead in trespasses and sins, signify just nothing, without special power from on high, to render them efficacious, which neither will be allowed us. And Secondly, we are told that Christ has added to the Moral Law, which is to lay more Load on those who were before overcharged; so that (as he makes Covenants) Adam's was much the better Covenant of the two: But he has wisely shuffled in a Promise of the Pardon of Sin, which may seem to give his Covenant a preëminence above that of Adam: But that will not mend the matter, both because it's better to have no sin in our Na-

tures than *such a Remedy*, better to have *no Wound* than *such a Plaster*, and also because the *Promise of Pardon* is *suspended upon the condition of Faith and Obedience*, which without *supernaturally real influx of immediate Divine Power* reduces the promise to an *impossibility of performance*. 2. This Covenant which he has here described, is *no New-Covenant* in opposition to the *old Administration of the Covenant of Grace*. There were the same promises *then* that we have *now*, the same *moral precepts to observe* that we have *now*; and though the word [*Gospel*] comes in for a blind, yet the Apostle assures us, *Gal. 3. 8. That Abraham had the Gospel-Preached to him.*

¶ 4. 3. Upon the matter, it's no Covenant of Grace at all. For, 1. *A Promise of Pardon and Life, upon Condition of Believing and Obeying*, is neither better nor worse, than a *threatning of Condemnation and Death*, to them who *Believe not, and Obey not*. It may with equal right be called a *threatning of Death*, as a *Promise of Life*: It's no more a *Covenant of Grace* than a *Covenant of Wrath*; and therefore, 2. (if it be lawful to consider Man as the Word of God describes him, as *dead in Sins and Trespasses*, as one that of himself cannot think a good thought, that can do nothing at all without Christ) It's no Covenant at all to him under his present circumstances; for what is the *nice difference* between a *Promise of Life*, to him that obeys, when it's certain before-hand he cannot obey, and *no Promise at all*? 3. This Covenant which he calls *New*, (and well he may, for it's of his own making, or however of his own *new-vamping*) assigns the same conditions

hours of Pardon and Eternal Life; but the Scripture requires other qualifications for Eternal Life, than for the Pardon of Sin. A Believer may be justified without a sinless perfection, but without such a sinless perfection none shall enter into Glory: He may be actually justified, that has not persevered in Holy Obedience to the Death; but without such perseverance he can never be made partaker of Eternal Life. 4. This Covenant of his is supposed to be made with all Mankind, and yet all Mankind never heard of it: Now is it not very admirable, and to be placed amongst the wonders of the New-Divinity, that God should enter into a Covenant with all the World to Pardon and save them upon condition of Faith & Obedience, and yet not let many of them know a syllable of it? Nay, that he should expressly countermand the promulgating of the Gospel to them? And yet so has God done even by the preaching of the true Covenant of Grace: Acts 16. 6, 7. Now when they had gone throughout all Phrygia, and the Region of Galatia, and were forbidden by the Holy Ghost to Preach the word in Asia; After they were come to Mylia, they assayed to go into Bithynia, but the Spirit suffered them not.

(2.) Let us now briefly consider his Assertion: That the Covenant of Grace (such a one as he has made for us) is owing to the Sacrifice of Christ's death, and the Righteousness of his Life: That God being pleased with these, for Christ's sake entered into a New Covenant with Mankind. I must tell the Reader that I have narrowly pryed into this Section, wherein I find frequent assertions of this Doctrine, That the Covenant of Grace is owing to, procured by, founded on the Obedience of Christ's Life, and the Sacrifice of his Death;

Death; and yet so unhappy have I been in my search that I cannot find any Proof, or any attempt to prove it; and therefore (till I see evidence to the contrary) I shall take it for granted, that the Covenant of Grace is owing to, founded on, and given forth by that free Grace of God, from whence it is justly denominated *A Covenant of Grace*; though the intervention of a Mediator, such a Mediator, was absolutely necessary to put us into the *Actual* possession of those rich mercies designed for us by God in that Covenant; which Mediator himself is owing to, founded on that Covenant of Grace, and therefore the Covenant of Grace is not founded upon him: but indeed for that Covenant which he is pleased to call a *New-Covenant*, and a *Covenant of Grace*, it's no great matter where 'tis founded, and therefore let him dispose of his own Creature as he pleases.

(3.) He supposes that Christ's Obedience and Sacrifice had no other influence upon our acceptance with God, but that for his sake he entered into such a Covenant with Mankind. This is all, however that he can find; But this is a most miserable All, and either is just nothing, or very near it. For, §. 1. Let him of Courtesy Answer one Question more since he is so good at it, *Whether God was ever at any time unwilling to pardon sin, and give Eternal Life, so those who did believe his Promises, and obey his Precepts?* If he was unwilling; Then let him shew how Christ's Obedience and Sacrifice, did operate upon God to alter his will, and of unwilling to make him willing: what could there be in the Sacrifice of Christ's Death, or the Righteousness of his Life, that should make God more in Love with Faith and Obedience, than he had been before? But if God was willing, and that

that without respect to Christ: then how does he give the Pardon of sin and Eternal Life, to them who Believe and Obey for Christ's sake? I am sure of our Authors good-Nature in this point: he will say, he has said it. That some, that many were saved without respect to Christ: The mercy and Grace of God (it seems) accepting their Belief of particular Revelations, and their sincere Obedience to his Commands, Repentance supplying the defects, and shortness of their Conformity to the Law: Now if God did all this without regard to Christ, how does he do it for the sake of Christ? But there's an Answer to this, that lies Dormant in the word [Promise] God did indeed Pardon sin, and give Eternal Life, to those who believed his Revelations, and obeyed his Commandments; but he never promised he would do it. But now he has drawn out his Grace and good-will into a Promise to pardon sin and give Eternal Life; upon the terms aforesaid, and this he has done for Christ's sake. And let us Audit the Account; and observe influence that Christ's Obedience and Sacrifice hath upon our acceptation with God, is, that we have got a promise from God to do that which he would have done before; to give us that he would have given us before; only he would not promise to do it for us, to give it to us. Two things I shall briefly return. 1. That God under the Old-Testament made explicit promises of the pardon of Sin, and Eternal Life; and if, under that Dispensation, I am sure our Author will say, without respect to Christ: that this was the Doctrine of the Old-Testament, the Apostle asserts, *Act. 13. 40.* To him give all the Prophets witness, that through his Name, whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins. 2 Sam.

7. 14. I will be his Father, and he shall be my Son; and there's enough in that to secure a promise of pardon to a repenting Child. Mal. 3. 17. They shall be mine, and I will spare them as a Father spares his own son that serves him: but it is added, If he sin against me, I will chasten him with the Rod of Men, but my Mercy shall not depart from him. Ps. 99. 8. Thou answeredst them, O Lord our God, thou wast a God that forgavest them, though thou takest vengeance on their inventions. And as the pardoning Grace that was in God's Nature was revealed to them, as the foundation of their Faith and obedience, Ps. 130. 4. There is forgiveness with thee that thou mayst be feared. So it is drawn out into a promise, v. 8. He shall redeem Israel from all his Iniquities, which without the pardon of them is simply impossible. As for the Promises of Eternal Life, we find good old Jacob now giving up the Ghost, and having no hope in this Life; expressing his Faith thus, Gen. 49. 18. I have waited for thy Salvation, O Lord! Which doubtless was Eternal Salvation, beyond the Verge of that short time of his Life, which he knew was expired. Ps. 73. 24. Thou shalt guide me with thy Counsel, (in my pilgrimage) and afterwards receive me to glory: but a more convenient place will offer it self for the discussing of this matter. 2. If then this be all that the Obedience of Christ's Life and the Sacrifice of his Death do contribute to our acceptance with God, that for Christ's sake we have got a Promise, or a more explicate Promise of the pardon of sin, and Eternal Life than before; then I must be of the same mind still, that it contributes just nothing to the acceptance of our Obedience with God. Let me have Liberty to put the Case of two Persons, v. 2.

David

David and Paul; let us suppose these two, equally obedient to God's commands, the former without such an express and explicate promise of Reward the other, encouraged by stronger Arguments of cleat and numerous Promises of Pardon, and Eternal Life: Which of these two is more accepted of God? He that performed equal Obedience, upon more feeble encouragements; or he that upon stronger Motives, yet gave but equal Obedience? If Reason might determine this Controversy, it would clearly carry it for him, that bore equal burden with less strength, performed equal duty upon less inducements: If then this be all the influence that the Obedience and death of Christ have upon our Acceptation with God; that thereby we have got a greater help to obedience, the best Answer to the Question had been, that it has no influence upon our Acceptance with God. §. 2. His Answer signifies nothing or very near it: for the Question was, *What Influence Christ's Active and Passive Obedience have upon our Acceptance with God?* And he has framed an Answer to another Question: *What Influence Christ's Active and Passive Obedience have upon our Obedience?* Which is quite another thing. If Christ's Obedience have any influence upon our acceptance with God, then God for Christ's sake must accept us, and our Obedience for the sake of Christ, which otherwise he had not, would not have done; and Christ must be supposed to have done and suffered something, which had such an influence upon God, as to procure the favour of God towards our persons and services, which without that consideration had not been, could not be procured: But if this be all, That God has made us a Promise to accept that Obedience

ence for Christ's sake, which (without any respect to Christ) would have accepted, though not say he would accept; then if our obedience be little, Christ will not make it reputed much, if imperfect, Christ's Obedience will not render it perfect; and thus in plain Terms, *The Sacrifice of his Death, and Righteousness of his Life procure no acceptance at all, nor in the least of our Persons or Obedience with God.* (3.) His Answer is so like nothing, as cannot be discerned from nothing: The Question was, *What influence Christ's Righteousness and Sacrifice have upon our acceptance with God?* The Answer is, *God for Christ's sake entered into a New-Covenant with Mankind, &c.* which is to leave the Question just as he found it (and if he leave it no worse, it's pardonable) for it will be enquired still, *What influence the Righteousness of Christ's Life, and the Sacrifice of his Death had upon God to move him to enter into such a Covenant?* Under what Notion did his Life and Death operate upon God? Did Christ make a proper *Reconciliation* and *Atonement* with God? Was his Death a proper *Sacrifice*? Did it *expiate the Guilt of Sin*? No, not a syllable of all this; only for fashions sake it must be said to have had *An influence*; though what it is, or how it had that influence, he cannot tell. But he will speak to these things more distinctly.

[1.] *What influence the Death of Christ has upon our Acceptation with God?* But it is to be supposed that we have had our Answer, and must sit down by it. That God was so well pleased with the Sacrifice of Christ's Death, that for his sake he entered into a New-Covenant with Mankind: The Proof is all in all; Why, this is plain (says he) in reference to his Death; Hence the Blood of Christ is called the Blood of the Co-

venant;

covenant, Heb. 10. 29. It's plain, that God for Christ's sake entered into this Covenant, because his Blood is called the Blood of the new Covenant: but yet it's not so very plain neither; A man may possibly mistake it for all that he has said to satisfy him: well! But then Christ is called the great Shepherd, and Bishop of Souls through the blood of the everlasting Covenant, Heb. 13. 20. but I can find no such Scripture: well; However, The Blood of Christ is called the Blood of sprinkling, which speaks better things than the Blood of Abel, Heb. 12. 24. which is an Allusion to Moles his sprinkling the Blood of the Sacrifice, wherewith he confirmed and ratified the Covenant, between God and the Children of Israel, &c. I expected it would come to this at long run; God entered into the Covenant for the sake of Christ's Death, because his Death confirmed the Covenant: A very trim Reason! The confirming of a Covenant, supposes a Covenant in being; If then all the design of the Blood of Christ was to confirm and ratifie a Covenant, it will not follow that therefore God did enter into such a Covenant for the sake of the Blood, but therefore he did not. I deny not that the Death of Christ was a great Confirmation of the true Covenant of Grace to our Faith: For what stronger Confirmation could the most jealous Soul desire of the reality of free Grace promising to pardon sin, and bestow Eternal Life upon believers, than that the Son of God himself should first take upon him our Nature, and in that Nature offer up himself to God, to atone and reconcile him to us; that he should make satisfaction to God's rectoral Justice, and pay the price of our Redemption, thereby removing out of the way of our Faith the grand impediments of it, the Justice

Justice of God and the Commination of the Law, which stood in the way of our Pardon, and Salvation? But to obviate our Author's design, I shall a little divert the Reader with the consideration of these Propositions: 1. *The Confirmation of such a Covenant as he has described (viz. a Promise of the Pardon of sin and Eternal Life to those who believe and obey the Gospel) was not the main end of the Death of Christ:* 1. Because there is such an end ascribed to his Death, which the Death of no other person in the world, could in any wise reach: but now to confirm the Gospel, and all the Promises thereof was an end which the Death of another might reach; therefore this was not the main end of the Death of Christ. The crucifying of Peter, the Martyrdom of Paul, were a great Confirmation of the Doctrine which they Preached; the Doctrine which they Preach't was the Gospel, and all its Promises; yet neither was the Death of the one, or other, able to reach the great Design of the Death of Christ: 1 Cor. 1. 18. *Was Paul Crucified for you? Or were you Baptized into the Name of Paul?* None could be Crucified for Sinners in that way that Christ was Crucified for them, into whose Name they might not be Baptized: but into the Name of no mere Man might they be Baptized; therefore no mere Man could be Crucified for sinners in that way, and for those ends which Christ was Crucified for. Paul suffered Death for the Churches good, but not in the Churches stead: He dyed to Confirm what he Preacht, and he Preacht the Covenant of Grace with all its Promises; yet he was not Crucified for the Church, his Soul was not made an Offering for sin, God laid not upon him all our Iniquities; his Death was

not

not a *Sacrifice of Propitiation*: And yet all this may be said of *Paul's Death*, if those expressions applied to the *Death of Christ*, signify no more than a *Confirmation of the Gospel*. 2. The Scripture assigns greater ends to the *Death of Christ*, than confirmation of Promises: 1. His *Death as a Sacrifice atoned God*. 2. His *Death as a Price paid to God redeemed us*. 3. His *Death as a Punishment exacted of God, satisfied his Justice*. For the first, *Isa. 53. 10. his Soul was made an Offering for sin*; and therefore as *a Sacrifice of Atonement*, God laid on him the Iniquities of us all, v. 6. For the second, *1 Tim. 2. 6. He gave himself a Ransom, or Price of Redemption for all*. For the third, *Rom. 3. 25, 26. The Blood of Christ is said to be a Declaration of God's Righteousness, that he might be just in justifying the Believer*; which Testimonies will call for clearing and vindication in due time. And these indeed are *such ends of the Death of Christ*, as will undeniably prove, that his *Death had an Influence upon our Acceptance with God*. 3. The Scripture owns Christ as a *proper Priest*; and therefore his Work must be somewhat more, than confirming a Doctrine. A Prophet will abundantly answer that design: But our Author prudently having cut out Christ some work to do, has fitted him with an Office too, which is proportionable to it; for to what purpose should Christ be a Priest, that has nothing to do with his Sacrifice, but to confirm his Doctrine? The direct and immediate Object of Christ's Sacerdotal Office was God, *Heb. 9. 14, 15. How much more shall the Blood of Christ, who through the Eternal Spirit offered himself to God, purge your Consciences?* I know these Men will say that Christ offered up himself to God in Heb.

son, but not upon the Cross: whereas the Blood of Christ is here compared with, though preferred to the Blood of Bulls and Goats, and the Ashes of a heifer sprinkling the unclean, some of which were never carried into the Holy Place; and the Blood of those which were, was first shed at the Altar, before it could be sprinkled at the Mercy-Seat: And the word here used *we propose*, is a sacred and religious Word, applied to the Sacrifices which were brought to, and offered at the Altar. Again, Heb. 5. 1. Christ is *ordained a Priest in things pertaining to God*. His Priestly Employment lay mainly with this, to confirm promises that relate to us men; but a Priest offers not Sacrifice to the People, though for the People. Christ's Business as our High-Priest was with God, and in his Undertaking with him, lyeth the true Reason of the Acceptation of our Persons & Services with God. 4. The Scripture every-where expresses Christ's Innocency, nay his perfect Holiness, the cheerfulness, self-denial, constancy, universality of his Obedience to his Father's Will, especially the Law of the Mediator. He always did the Things that pleased his Father, Joh. 8. 29. He fulfilled all Righteousness, Mat. 3. 15. His Meat and Drink was to do the Will of him that sent him, and to finish his Work, Joh. 4. 34. He came not to do his own Will, but the Will of him that sent him, Joh. 6. 38. And the Father has witnessed it most solemnly by a Voice from Heaven, That he was well-pleased with his beloved Son, Mat 17. 5. and yet notwithstanding all this, and much more that might be said, He pleased the Father to bruise him, and make his Soul an Offering for Sin, Isa. 53. 10. He loved him, and yet showed all imaginable tokens of displeasure;

he was amazed, sore troubled in Soul, and (as to the apprehension of his Soul) in respect of comfort forsaken of God, so that he cried out of it most bitterly: *My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?* And in the view of his approaching sufferings was in such an Agony, and conflict of Soul, that it expressed Clouds of Blood from his labouring Body: Upon consideration of which unexpressible, inconceivable Torments of the Lord Jesus, the Ancient Church did use to pray, *Ὁ ἅγιος πατρις ὁς, By thy unknown Torments, Lord deliver us:* In imitation whereof perhaps the Liturgy of the present Church of England uses the like: *By thy Agony and Bloody Sweat, by thy Cross and Passion, &c.* Now I would have it resolved to satisfaction, without such pious dry evasions, and paltry answers as we meet with from some kind of men: 1. How God could at the same time be well-pleased with Christ, and be so well-pleased to bruise him? 2. How it could consist with the Justice of God, to punish a Person so Innocent, so Holy, so completely Righteous, over whom the condemning Part of the Law had no power, seeing he had never violated it, in its preceptive Part, unless he stood in the stead of Sinners, bore their Iniquities, and was charged with their Guilt? They will tell us, that God used his Prerogative, and Sovereignty over Jesus Christ; and yet in other causes will not allow him an absolute and irrelative Sovereignty over the poorest Wretch in the World: They will tell us too, That all this was not proper penalty or punishment; but here was the matter of punishment to purpose: and still the difficulty remains, Why an Innocent Person should suffer the same things materially, which were only

formally to be inflicted upon those who had deserved them? Let none say, If Christ bore the Punishment due to sin, he must suffer *Eternal Death*; seeing *no less was due* to our Transgressions: For 1. The Eternity of punishment is only due to sin by *accidents*, as it is found in a *finite Person*, who being not able to bear *at once*, or in the longest time, that *Wrath* which his Sins have demerited; Divine Justice exacts of him an *Eternity* of suffering. 2. Whereas sin is only infinite, or of infinite demerit, *objective*, as committed against an *infinite God*: The Sufferings of Christ are infinite also *subjective*, being the Sufferings of *that Person* who is God, though not *as God*; and therefore Christ in a *finite time* was able to give *infinite Satisfaction*. 3. Christ was such an *High-Priest*, as being *God and Man*, was able to give an *infinite Value* to his Sacrifice of himself *as Man*; nor let any say that if Christ suffered in a way of Satisfaction to Divine Justice, and bore what the Sinner should have born, or that which was *equivalent* to it, that then the Sinner ought *immediately* to be *delivered from the Curse* due to his sin; for seeing that the Satisfaction was not made in *the Person* of the Offender, but his *Substitute*, it was necessary that the benefit of *another's Satisfaction* should be communicated in such a way as might best please that God, whose Grate was the *only Motive* to his Acceptation of a *Substitute*: It's the undoubted priviledg of the Giver to dispose of his *own Gift* in his *own Way*; and it was absolutely and indispensibly necessary that the Sinner should be *duly qualified* to receive so *transcendent Favours*, purchased at so *dear rates*, and fitted to return the Glory due to a Redeemer,

mer, which an unhumbled, unbelieving, unconverted, &c. unsanctified Sinner could not possibly be.

(2) The Death of Christ (devoided of those its proper respects of a *Sacrifice* offered to God to *atone* and *reconcile* him: a *price* paid to ransom, and redeem us, and a *Punishment* born to *satisfie* Divine Justice, was no infallible proof of the Doctrine which he preached: For 1. Many have laid down their lives to *Abett*, and endured extremity of Tortures rather than *renege* the Doctrine: they have openly preached; their Confidence (the mean while) supported either by a *mistaken Conscience*, or perhaps *some sinister respects*. All that it can prove in the largest judgment of Charity is, That they *suppose* their Doctrine to be true, or else would hardly lose their *All*, rather than lose a *Principle*; but not that *therefore* the Doctrine is true, because the Preacher dies for it. That which is *false in it self*, will not become true, by laying down our life for it. In the Memory of the last Age, there were some who sacrificed their lives to the Flames in defence of *Contradictory Doctrines*: So that to say that the Death of Christ has no other use, but To confirm the Truth of that Doctrine which he preacht, is but a more modest, civil and gentle way of saying it has no use at all. 2. To whom should the Death of Christ confirm the Truth of his Doctrine, to his Enemies or his Friends? For his *Enemies*: Many of his Sufferings, the very greatest and foret of his Sufferings were out of their notice; either privately in the Garden, or more privately in his Soul, such as whereof they could take no cognizance: and for these which were visible; they looked on them as the just rewards of his violation of the Law. As for

his Friends, his Death considered singly in it self, without respect to its proper Ends, was so far from confirming of their Faith, or Belief of his Doctrine, that it was that which *shook their hopes, and dashed their expectations* out of countenance: their Hearts died in his Death, and *above two* expressed the Sense of more than their own diffidence, Luk. 24. *We trusted that it had been he that should have redeemed Israel.* But whether to Friends, or Enemies, the Death of Christ (considered without his antecedent Miracles, and subsequent Resurrection, and concomitant Sacrifice) was so improper a means to confirm, that it had proved the clearest Confutation of his Doctrine that malice could have desired. (3.) The Death of Christ was so far from confirming this Doctrine, That God would pardon Sinners, that *separate this one Consideration of it as satisfactory to Divine Justice*, from his Death; and it quite overthrows the credibility of the Doctrine, and runs all the World down into utter despair. For our Author must have a happy dexterity, if he can conclude, that because God dealt so severely with an innocent holy Person, that therefore he will not fail to pardon repenting Sinners. We must despair that ever repentance should make us personally equal with Christ: If then God did these things in the green Tree, what will he do in the Dry? If Judgment begun at God's own House, where shall the Ungodly and Sinner appear? He that spared not his own Son, how much less will he spare the Sinner? It could not be expected that any should believe Christ, telling them God would pity and pardon others, who found him so severe to himself: But that indeed the true Reason why God deals so graciously

ously with the *repenting Sinner*, is because he will
 die so justly with his *own Son*, voluntarily becoming
 his *Surety and Substitute*. (4.) There were pro-
 per proofs designed by God for the *Confirmation* of
 the *Doctrine of Christ*; and no need at all to take
 sanctuary in that which (nakedly considered) was
 not so. Those frequent, clear, *stupendous Miracles*
 wrought by Christ, were fully adequate, and commensu-
 rate to that End. Reason will teach us to believe
 that God will not alter the *course of Nature*, nor re-
 verse its standing *Laws*, to confirm a *Lye*, to bear
 witness to a *grand Imposture*. And surely they who
 would not believe Christ to be *sent of God*, upon his
 Testimony to him in those *Extraordinary Works*,
 would never believe it for his *Death* which was no
 wonder at all; otherwise than as the fruit of his in-
 effable Love, offering himself to God as a *Sacrifice*
 for Sin; and so indeed it was the *greatest Wonder* of
 them all. The *Enemies* of Christ triumph in his
Death, that they had nailed his *Cause* with his *Per-
 son* to the *Cross*; and that which they feared was his
Resurrection: A Miracle so far beyond all excepti-
 on, to confirm that he was *sent of God*, and there-
 fore his *Doctrine* must needs be true, that their
 greatest care was to have prevented it, by *sealing the
 Stone*, and *setting a Watch*. (5.) But supposing
 that the *Death of Christ* had confirmed his *Doctrine*, and
 particularly this, That God would pardon, and save
 the *Believing, and Obedient Sinner*: Yet still what
 influence has this upon our *Acceptance with God*?
 Will God accept our *Obedience* the more, because we
 have *greater helps* to obey? May our duty expect
 a *greater Reward* because we come easier by it? But
 when all is said that our Author can say, it's our

Obedience that hath *the Influence* upon our *Acceptance with God*, and *Christ's Death* has only an *Influence* upon our *Obedience*. The same Obedience given to the Commands of the Gospel, *without the motive of his Death*, had found equal, if not greater Acceptance from him, than when drawn from us by so cogent an Argument. But if the Death of Christ may be said to have any influence upon our Acceptance with God, because he thereby confirmed his Doctrine; then the Death of the Martyrs also may be said to have an Influence upon our Acceptance with him; for they by their Deaths confirmed the Truth which they preached, which Truth was the true Government of Grace. And whereas many of them laid down their Lives with that Heroical Magnanimity, with that gallantry of Spirit, with more than that boasted Stoical valour, kissing the Stake, embracing the Flames, triumphantly singing in the midst of their Torments, professing they felt no more pain than two Bed of Roses, as if they were to ascend Heaven in that fiery Chariot, to the Consolation of their Enemies, the encouraging of their Friends, and the credit of that Gospel they died for; evidently assuring all, that they were immediately supported from above to bear with patience, nay with exultation, those extremities which to Flesh and Blood were intolerable. We see our Blessed Saviour (on the contrary) in his Sufferings strangely dejected, unmixed, troubled in Soul; earnestly begging that if it were possible this Cup might pass from him, and crying out in the bitterness of his Soul, That he was forsaken of God; which consideration is enough to satisfy an impartial Enquirer, That the Sufferings of Christ were fitted for some bigger design than the confirm-

firm.

firming of Truth, for which end (had there been nothing more in it) the Death of the Martyrs had clearly out-gone it.

But it's high time to recollect our selves, and return into the way again; for those pitiful things which stand for proof, that this was all the design of the Death of Christ, call aloud for examination.

The Blood of Christ (says he) is called the Blood of Sprinkling, which speaks better things than the Blood of Abel, Heb. 12. 24. which is an allusion to Moses his Sprinkling the Blood of the Sacrifice, whereby he confirmed the Covenant between God and the Children of Israel, Heb. 9. 20, 21. For when Moses had spoken every precept to the People according to the Law, he took the Blood of Calves and Goats, and sprinkled both the Book and all the People, saying: This is the Blood of the Testament, which God hath ordained for you. Thus the Blood of Christ is called the Blood of Sprinkling, because by his Blood God did seal and confirm the Covenant of Grace, as the sprinkling of Blood did confirm the Mosaical Covenant.

There are four things which I shall offer, any one of which cleared up, will shew the vanity of this Period.

S. 1. The Blood of Christ, is not called the Blood of Sprinkling, which speaks better things than the Blood of Abel: only in allusion to the Sprinkling of that Blood which confirmed the Mosaical Covenant: There is a further, a higher design in the Expression. The Blood of Abel cried to God from the Earth, for vengeance upon the Head of Cain; and with the same importunity does the violation of every Law of God sollicite Divine Justice against the Transgressor; and that with great justice: For the same
God,

God, who hath established his Holy Law, in the *Promise*. *Do this and live*, hath bound, and confirm'd it also with the threatening, *If thou sinest thou shalt die*. Such dreadful things did the Blood of *Abel* (shed in defiance of the Law) speak to God : But O what sweet, how much better things does the Blood of Christ speak ! It speaks better things to the Justice of God, than if the Sinner himself should suffer his utmost Indignation : It speaks better things to the Law, than if the Sinner had felt the weight of its severest Curse : It speaks better things to the Conscience, than if we had wrought out our inward Peace by our own Righteousness : It satisfies God's Justice, answers the Law, and quiets the Conscience : And in reference to this use of the Sprinkling of Blood, viz. the Atoning, and Reconciling of God, is the Blood of Christ, called the *Blood of Sprinkling* : and to this the Apostle refers, Heb. 11. 28. *By Faith Moses kept the Passover, and the Sprinkling of Blood, that he who destroyed the first-born might not touch them*. The Apostle evidently points to Exod. 12. 14. *The Blood shall be to you a token upon your Houses, and when I see the Blood, I will pass over you, and the Plague shall not be upon you*. v. 21, 22. *Kill the Passover, and you shall take a Branch of Hyssop and dip in the Blood, and strike the Lintel, and the two side-Posts, and none of you shall go out of his House until the Morning*. Now here are several things observable: 1. That it was a respect to the Blood of the Paschal-Lamb duly used and applyed, in consideration whereof God would not destroy them with the rest. 2. That if they expected any benefit from that Blood, they must abide under the shelter and protection of it. 3. This Blood

Blood must be sprinkled upon the *Lintel*, not upon the *Threshold*, to mind them, (as the Jews observe) that they ought not to *trample it under their feet*. And surely that Blood which turns away the deserved wrath of God from *their head*, might claim more reverence than to be trampled *under their feet*.

That this Blood thus sprinkled was considerable in God's eyes, as it was the *Blood of such a Lamb, so chosen out of the flock, without any spot or blemish, and is slain*, precisely according to God's appointment: In just proportion, the Lord Jesus Christ is called expressly our *Passeeover*, 1 Cor. 5. 7. *Christ our Passeeover is Sacrificed for you*. Now as the Blood of Christ has the *same influence*, so it has the *same plea*; it has the same Influence upon God, it turns away his Anger, he has a respect to the Blood of Jesus; under this Blood do we take shelter and Sanctuary; and therefore is *placide with us* that we account it not an *unholy thing*, for that will be interpreted a *trampling under foot the Son of God himself*, Heb. 10. 29. which is to despise all the Grace and Mercy of God, for what-ever Mercy we receive from God, it is through the *intercession* of that Blood,

1. 2. The whole concern of the Blood of Christ is expressed by the *Blood of Sprinkling*. Sprinkling was one way, and *but one way* of employing the Blood of the Sacrifice; but it must be shed, before it could be sprinkled, and therefore *sprinkled*, because it had been *shed as a Sacrifice*. What-ever other use there was of the Blood of Sacrifices, yet the efficacy of all was derived from this, that that Blood had been *once shed at the Altar*, Lev. 17. 11. It was *shed upon the Altar* (and that not merely as Blood,

but

But as it was the *Life-Blood of the Sacrifice* substituted in the room of the offender) that made an *Atonement* for their Souls. And this is evident in that the Blood of many of the Sacrifices for sin, atoning, expiating Sacrifices, were *not sprinkled*, but only shed at the Altar: What an unrighteous dealing is this then with the Blood of Christ, to allow it no service but only the Confirmation of a Covenant, because it is called the *Blood of sprinkling*? whereas the Blood of the Sacrifices of old as it was sprinkled, did not express all the ends and uses of the Blood of Christ.

S. 3. That which comes home to our Author is this: The whole design of the *Blood of sprinkling* was not to confirm a Covenant. As Blood was larger than sprinkling of Blood; so sprinkling of Blood was larger than the confirming of a Covenant. (1.) The Blood of the Sacrifice was sometimes sprinkled to turn away God's Anger: thus in the Passover and thus in that very place which our Author insists upon, Heb. 9. 19. which the Apostle takes from Exod. 24. 5, 6, 7. where we read of a twofold Use of the Blood: First, *one half of the Blood of the Burnt-Offering, and the Peace-Offering* which had been shed at the Altar, Moses sprinkled upon the Altar: Now all the use of Blood upon the Altar was *Atonement, Propitiation, and Reconciliation to God*. Secondly, With the other half of the Blood, Moses consecrates and dedicates the People to the Lord, to walk before him according to the Tenor of that Covenant: whereas then he will argue that the Blood was sprinkled only to confirm a Covenant, because one half of it was reserved for that as a secondary Use; some fully, ill-conditioned People would

would conclude, that it was not used to confirm a Covenant, because the other half was not employed for that use. (2.) Another use of the Blood of the Sacrifice sprinkled, was to procure the favour of God, 2. Chron. 29. 21, 22. where we read: 1. That all these Lambs, Bulls, Rams, Goats, were offered to God at the Altar, Hezekiah commanded the Priests to offer them on the Altar. 2. That when the Blood had been shed at the Altar, it was afterwards sprinkled on the Altar. 3. To shew that the great operation of the Blood (even as sprinkled) was by virtue of its having been once shed at the Altar. The two Goats of the Sin-Offering were only slain by the Priests, after they had laid their hands on them, and thereby laid the sins of the People upon them, in their typical way; but their Blood was not at all sprinkled on the Altar, and yet the greatest efficacy is ascribed to them as the Sin-Offering. 4. The design of all these sacrifices, their Offering upon the Altar, the shedding and then sprinkling of the Blood; is said to be v. 24. to make Reconciliation with their Blood upon the Altar and to make Atonement for all Israel. 5. And that none might harp upon the old humour, that surely the People were fallen out among themselves, were all in Mutiny and Civil-Wars, and this Blood was to reconcile them, and make them friends; We are told, It was for all Israel, for the Kingdom, the Sanctuary, for Judah, for Church and State, Prince and People: All had offended God, and this was the typical way of recovering his favour, and regaining a Communion with him in his Temple. (3.) The Blood was sprinkled also for Purification and Cleansing, Lev. 14. 5. Answerable hereto, God has promised in the Covenant of Grace, that he will sprinkle

sprinkle his people with clean water, and from all their Idols and Abominations will he cleanse them, Ezek. 36. which he effects by the power of the Holy Spirit, and by the Blood of Jesus. Therefore are Saluts called elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through the Sanctification of the Spirit unto obedience, and sprinkling of the Blood of Jesus Christ. 1 Pet. 1:2. (4.) The Blood was sprinkled before the Altar, Gen. 14:18. Lev. 16: 15. When the Priest had shed the blood of the Sacrifice at the Altar, and offer'd it to God, he carries in some of the Blood into the most Holy place, and by that Blood intercedes with God for the People: Thus our Lord Jesus, when by the offering of himself he had made an Atonement with God for sin, discharges the other great part of his Priesthood, becomes our intercessor at the throne of Grace, and by the merit and virtue of that Blood which was once shed for the reconciling of God, and procuring his favour, he lives for ever to make intercession for us. And now I suppose it may be left to all indifferent Persons to judge, whether our Author has not most barbarously Murdered the Death of Christ it self, and trampled his sacred Blood under his feet, allowing no other end or use to it, but that of confirming a Covenant; whereas considered as the Blood of sprinkling, it has far greater and higher end, and yet the Blood as sprinkled, comprehends not the whole design of that Blood.

S. 4. But yet supposing, That all the ends of the Death of Christ were wrap'd up in that one expression [the Blood of sprinkling] and supposing also that the Blood of the Sacrifices as sprinkled, had no other end or use but the confirming of a Covenant; yet how

will this prove his main Assertion, That we owe the Covenant of Grace to the Death of Christ? All that will follow is, that we owe the Confirmation of the Covenant to it, and only the Confirmation of the Covenant; and then another thing will follow too, that we do not owe the Covenant itself to it, unless he can prove that procuring and confirming are Terms of the same Importance.

The advantage our Author has got by this way of Reasoning is, that he has found out a way how to run all Scripture-Expressions, and yet accommodate them to his own preconceived Opinions. [1.] Hence (says he) we are said to be justified by the Blood of Christ, Rom. 5. 9. That is, by the Gospel-Covenant which was confirmed, and ratified by his Death: To which I Answer. 1. If we may be said to be justified by his Blood, because his Blood confirmed the Covenant, then we may be said more properly to be justified by his Miracles; for they indeed had a proper, direct, immediate, and sufficient evidence in them to confirm the Doctrine which he Preacht; and it's a Miracle almost as great as any of them, that the Scripture should never once intimate that we are justified by Miracles, which directly and properly confirmed his Doctrine; and yet constantly affirm it of his Death, which directly and properly confirmed it not. 2. Then also, with the same propriety of Speech, we may be said to be justified by the Blood of the Martyrs, which was a convincing Testimony that they believed their Doctrine to be true; and then the old Popish Rhime will come in fashion again: *Tu per Thomae sanguinem quem pro te impendis, Da nos Christo frondere, qua Thomas ascendit.* 3. If the Blood of Christ contribute no more to our justification than it

is confirmed the Truth of this proposition amongst others, *He that Believes, and obeys the Gospel, shall be pardoned and saved*: then it's possible to be justified without the Blood of Christ: God has given us many Arguments to confirm the Truth of the Gospel: If then I believe the Truth of what Christ preached upon those Arguments, which are suited to its confirmation, (as upon the evidence of Miracles, &c.) and accordingly obey all its Commands; It were very hard if I should miss of Pardon and Life for not believing it upon one single Argument, and that but a probable one neither: What if I Believe the Promise upon nine of God's Arguments, and hit not upon the Tenth, obey upon nine of God's Motives, and want only that single String to my Bow; shall my Faith and Obedience be rejected because not grounded upon every particular Reason that may possibly be Muster'd up to confirm them?

4. It will be in vain ever to speak or write again, if such far-fetched Consequences be allowed to interpret what is spoken and written. There are no two things in the world so remote each from other, but they have some kind of Relation and Affinity; and if this way will salve all, there will hardly be found that thing in the World, if it may but be conceived to have had any Relation as an Argument to our Faith and Obedience, but we may be said to be justified by it. We are said to be justified by the Blood of Christ. True! But how? Why thus: The Blood of Christ signifies his Death; His Death confirmed his Doctrine; His Doctrine was by that believes and obeys, shall be justified and saved; Hereupon we believe it to be true, and in process of time come to obey it, & our obedience justifies us, and therefore the Blood of Christ

Christ may be said to justify us. And whereas *Julias his Covetousness*, the Jews Envy, *Herod's Cruelty*, & *Pilate's Flattery*, had a direct tendency to the Death of Christ; why we may not be properly said to be justified by them also at this rate, I profess I cannot apprehend. Religion is fallen into most cruel and unmerciful hands in this latter Age, who to give a faint colour to any little sorry fancies of their own, are not to interpret Scripture in such ways as shall certainly open a dore to elude the plainest Truths. God is said to have made the World; Now if any has a mind to eternize his Name, which without *some rare discovery* cannot be, let him take our Author's Course, and he is secure of a Monument. That is indeed a Scripture phrase; but if you examine it thoroughly, it signifies no more, than that God made a company of *Atoms*, and put them in Motion, and then let them alone, they will dance you so long in infinite spaces till they jostle themselves into that form wherein you see things at this day: And thus here's a fair Account how God may be said to have made the World, because he made that which made the World; and the Cause of the Cause, (you know) may be said to be a Grand-Father-Cause of the thing Caus'd. But this is infinitely beyond what our Author will allow the Blood of Christ of Causality in our justification: for it's only a Confirming Cause of the Promise, and that in Commission with other things, and they have a greater stroke in the business than is self; & then when we come to believe that Promise, and that belief proves strong enough to perswade us into Obedience, then we are justified for the sake of that Obedience. But 5. The Consideration of the Text it self; Rom. 5. 9. is enough to discredit this

idle conceit for ever, for Christ is said to dye for us, and in order to our justification, in the same sense that the Avri-Luxer of old did, who laid down Life for Life, Blood for Blood, Body for Body. v. 6. Christ dyed for the ungodly. v. 7. For scarcely for a righteous Man will one dye; yet peradventure for a good Man some one would even dare to dye. v. 8. But God commendeth his love to us that while we were yet sinners Christ dyed for us. v. 9. Much more then being now justified by his Blood, *etc.*

[2.] Christ (says he) is called a Propitiation through Faith in his Blood; that is, by a belief of the Gospel Covenant, Rom. 3. 25. But how short this comes of the Apostle's design is obvious from the place. Christ is set forth by God to be a propitiation through faith in his Blood, to declare his Righteousness that he might be just, and the justifier of him that believes in Jesus. But is God, ever the more declared to be a just God, demonstrated to be a Righteous God, because Christ has confirmed his Doctrine, and we believe and obey it? The obedience of most men is so imperfect, that when they have done all they will need mercy, and that will declare one of God's attributes. But what provision is here made, that God may be declared Righteous and Just? All that he has assigned to the Blood of Christ turns not away the least of God's displeasure against sin or the sinner; Christ dyed to confirm his Doctrine! Well, but still God is displeased with sinners, for what Reason is there why God should be less displeased with them, because Christ dyed to confirm his Doctrine? Well, but hereupon Man believes this Doctrine to be true, but yet God's Anger is never the more turned away from the sinner, because he believes what

God

God says is true. For what Reason is there why God should be so displeased with him, who believes the Truth, and yet will not obey his Commands? So that neither the Blood of Christ, nor Faith neither, do reconcile God to us, or propitiate him for us: well, at last Man gives obedience to the Commands, and then God is propitiated and reconciled. So that the true Scripture should have been (had our Author had the penning of it) God hath set forth Man to be his own propitiation through his own obedience. And why might it not have been said, that God set forth the Martyrs to be a propitiation through Faith in their Blood? For they willingly and cheerfully shed their dearest Blood to confirm the Truth of the Gospel; and upon their Confirmation of it some have believed in, and upon their believing in have obeyed it, and then by that obedience are reconciled to God. And thus may Paul be said to have dyed for our sins, and Peter to have been Crucified for us; and both of them to have been set forth by God to be a propitiation through Faith in their Blood. Nor let any say, that the Death of the Martyrs was not so strong a confirmation of the Gospel as the Death of Christ: For if we believe the Truth, and obey it upon more infirm Evidence, yet if that evidence produce a strong Faith, and that a vigorous obedience, such an obedience will not find less acceptance with God, because it was begotten by weaker Motives.

[3] The Scripture (says he) uses these Phrases promiscuously, to be justified by Faith; and to be justified by the Faith of Christ; and to be justified by Christ; and to be justified through Faith in his Blood; and to be justified, and saved by Grace; Nay, by believing that Christ is the Son of God, John 20. 31. And

that God raised him up from the dead. When our Author has a design upon any great Truth of the Gospel, then the clearest expressions the wisdom of God's Spirit shall use, are *Phrases, allusive, figurative, metaphorical, tropical forms of Speech*: But the Scripture uses not these expressions *promiscuously*, only our Author confounds them *craftily*. Each of them have indeed something *in common with the rest*; and no wonder, all the *Officers*, the *Active and Passive Obedience of Christ*, the whole work of the Spirit, the actings of Faith, and every saving-Grace, meet in *this one great Project*, the glorifying of God, the Electing love of the Father, the Redeeming Love of the Son, and the Sanctifying love of the Holy Spirit, in the *Justification and Salvation of a Believer*: But yet each of these expressions carries in it *something peculiar to it self*: for the Scripture abhors to speak at his dull and cloudy rate, who by diversifying *one and the same thing* in twenty several shapes, can vend it for *so many several things*, when 'tis but the same notion disguised in a new-fashioned expression. One denotes *the interest of Faith*; another speaks the concern of him who is *Jehovah our Righteousness*; a third may particularly point at *the influence of his Blood in this matter*; another, *the evidence of all this*: But by this Argument he may fancy (and that may stand for Proof) that all things under Heaven signify one and the same thing: for I know *no two things* so perfect strangers but have *some cognation*, some common and general agreement, and meet in some *Latitudinarian Third* that will clasp their Interests: They must be related either as *Cause and effect*, or *Concauses of the same effect*; or as *joynt-effects of the same universal Cause*, &c. but
 now

now to say that *all these signify the same thing* formally because of some general coherence, is no more to my edification, than if our Author would prove himself a-kin to the great Mogul, because they have *two Elbows a-piece*: A way of Reasoning very much unbecoming a Rational Divine, especially one who trades so much in the essential differences of things. But suppose that *all these expressions* do signify one and the same thing: what is that *one thing* which they signify? The Answer is ready, *That we are justified by believing and obeying the Gospel*: This is the *one thing*, and this is the *one thing* that should have been proved; for if by [Gospel] he understand no more than the commands of the Gospel, and all the rest, as Promises and confirmations of Promises, thrown in as Motives and Arguments to that Obedience; then I say we are justified by *something else* than the Gospel, (that which he calls Gospel) even by the Blood of Christ, which is more than a Motive to Faith, or an Argument to Obedience (though a most excellent Motive, and Argument to both) being a proper propitiatory, expiatory, Sacrifice, to remove God's just displeasure, procure his favour and take away Guilt. But I shall willingly hear him practise upon the particulars.

(1.) Faith, or Faith in Christ, signifies such a firm stedfast belief of the Gospel, as brings forth all the fruits of Obedience: Therefore what? Why therefore to be justified by Faith, or by the Faith of Christ, or by Christ, signify to be justified by believing, and obeying the Gospel. Here's nothing but evidence wanting, for we have confidence enough: But then, 1. If a justifying Faith be such a firm and stedfast belief

of the Gospel as brings forth all the fruits of obedience, then no Man can be justified till he be in Heaven, or at least within one step of the actual possession of glory. One of the fruits of obedience is final perseverance; now Faith may produce one, or two, or twenty of the fruits of obedience; but yet if it fail before it has brought forth all the rest, it falls shorts of a justifying Faith. 2. If this be the true Notion of a justifying Faith; I doubt not to affirm that the Devils have as true a justifying Faith (as far as the essence of Faith reaches) as the best Saint on earth. It's true their Faith, does not bring forth the fruits of obedience; but that's only to say, they want a saving obedience, a justifying obedience; for all that is of the essence of Faith (as 'tis Faith) they have; they firmly and stedfastly believe the Gospel to be true, though their Faith produces not the fruits of obedience. That Faith which justifies will in due season produce all the fruits of obedience, yet a justifying Faith (as it justifies) does not include all the fruits of obedience. We read, 1 Job. 3. 2. He that hath this Hope in him [God] purifies himself as God is pure; whence it's plain, that a well-grounded hope will purify the heart; but if from thence any will infer that the Grace of hope, and the effects of hope, are formally the same, he will miserably expose his own ignorance.

(2.) To be justified by the grace of God that signifies the same thing too, viz. That we are justified by believing and obeying the Gospel. Now this is truly wonderful! but how does he prove it? why thus? The Grace of God is the Gospel of Christ, expressly so called in Tit. 2. 11. as being the Effect of the free Grace and Goodness of God to Mankind. To which I return; 1. It is very true, that the Gospel of Christ

is called Grace; as being the product of mere Grace, and contains the Methods of God's Grace in the justifying and recovering of Sinners. The word Grace signifies either the free Love and Favour of God towards us, or the effects of that Grace for us, or upon us; and thus the Revelation of God's Mind and Will, being one of the Effects of Grace, may be called Grace. But now that the Grace of God is the Gospel, that is, the Revelation of God's Mind and Will, is not true: Grace is larger than Gospel-Revelation. The Gospel reveals more Grace than what consists in Revelation. But he argues thus: The Gospel of Christ is called Grace, therefore the Grace of God is called the Gospel: as if he would conclude, that because every man is a living Creature, therefore every living Creature is a Man. But I wonder why any should pray so earnestly for true Repentance and the Holy Spirit, if Grace signify nothing but the Revelation of the Gospel: which a Man may purchase, filleted, and gilded for five Shillings: And all the Supplications of Christians for Grace, signify no more but that we may have the Scriptures, which is Grace indeed but not all the Grace promised in the Scriptures. 2. To be justified by Grace is quite another thing. Rom. 3. 24. Being justified freely by his Grace, through the Redemption that is in Jesus Christ. *Αμαρτιωνος δωρεαν τῆς χάριτος καὶ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ*: justified in a way of free Gift, which excludes the consideration of any thing inherent in us: for though so he saved by Grace, might allow some consideration of Obedience, and yet such is the infinite Disproportion between the Obedience and the Reward, that it may be called Grace; yet that will not satisfy the Expression, To be justified *Αμαρτιαν, gratis*, without

any consideration at all on the part of the Person justified, for which he is so justified. (3.) *Faith in the Blood of Christ is a belief of the Gospel, which was confirmed by his Blood.* Then farewell for ever all discourse, and writing: The Builders of Babel might sooner have guesst at one anothers meaning, after that the Curse of God had cleft their Tongues into seventy two Dialects, than here-after we shall understand the Conceptions of Men's Minds by the expressions of their Mouths. For if when the Apostle says *we are justified through Faith in his Blood*, he designs no more than that we are justified by believing and obeying the Gospel; then for ought I know our Author may intend as Orthodoxy as any Man living: and when he says *we are justified by believing and obeying the Gospel*, he may intend it only by way of evidence; but that *we are really justified through Faith in the Blood of Christ.* (4.) *To be justified by believing that Christ is the Son of God, signifies the same thing too,* Joh. 20. 31. But here our Author has relieved himself from his old Artifice which never failed him: the forcing Scripture over to him, when he is lazy, and will not stir a step to go to the Scripture. The Text speaks its own Language thus: *These things are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Son of God, and believing ye may have life through his Name;* where the Evangelist says not, *They are justified by believing that Jesus is the Son of God,* but that having first satisfied their Faith from Scripture that Jesus is the Son of God, (which Truth being well studied, well digested, and improved, will give us a marvelous light into the Mystery of the Gospel, and without which, the whole of the Gospel is involved in eternal Night)

and

and then believing, they have eternal Life through his Name, by his satisfactory Blood and Righteousness, and the Authority which he has thereby with the Father. But believe it, here is harder work than all this behind; for our Author will propound several Questions, and when he has done answer them. 1. *Quest.* What is it to believe that Christ is the Son of God? *Ans.* *That is, (says he) That Messiah, and Prophet whom God sent into the World.* Very good! Now as I remember p. 4. he told us, *That Christ was anointed to be the Messiah at his Baptism;* (let the Reader examine it): Now if to be the Son of God, be to be the Messiah, and that he was not the Messiah till his Baptism, then he was not the Son of God till his Baptism; and then for about 30 years he was *ἄλλος ἄνθρωπος, a mere Man;* and yet this is a great favour I assure you, for his Baptism was about three or four years before his Resurrection, and then they are to blame, who will suspect this Principle to be Socinian: well! But yet to believe Christ to be the Son of God, is to believe him to be the Messiah! Ay, But there's one odd misadventure more in the thing; that is, that Hebrew is easier than Greek; for if Messiah explain Christ any better, I am very much out in my reckoning. Some from hence will pretend to give us a Scheme of our Author's Faith about the Deity of Christ; and perhaps should they deal with him as he has dealt with others, or half so uncharitably, it would be found dissonant to what he professedly owns in subscribing the three Symbols of Faith: but I see no reason to fix an Opinion upon any Man that he will not openly avow. 2. *Quest.* But what is the Messiah? *Ans.* *Why, The Prophet whom God sent into the World to*
redeal

reveal his Will to us : To believe him to be *the Son of God*, is to believe him to be *the Messiah*, and to believe him to be *the Messiah* is to believe him to be *a Prophet*, and that is (as near as I can measure it) *just one third part* of his Mediatory Employment. Surely he has mean thoughts of his Reader's Intellectuals, or great presumptions upon their good-Natures, or a high esteem of the persuasiveness of his own Rhetorick, that can hope to proselyte them into a belief (without one Argument) That *the Son of God* signifies no other than *Messiah*, *Messiah* no more than *Prophet*; and that the Prophetical-Office of this *Messiah*, is the just, compleat Object of our Faith. 3. *Quest.* But what does this Belief of Christ to be *the Messiah*, *the Prophet*, include? *Ans.* A general Belief of the Gospel which he preaches: most rare Divinity! I suppose we may be saved upon very cheap terms by and by: For 1. A general Belief of the Gospel, will serve the turn to justify us well enough, that is as far as Faith has ought to do in Justification. If Faith believes Christ to be *the Messiah*, that is, *a Prophet whom God sent to reveal his Will to us*, it has got a general Belief of the Gospel, which may be without understanding, in particular one syllable of what Christ has revealed of his Father's Will; and then I suppose, a general Obedience will serve well enough for a general Faith. 2. We may believe Christ to be *the Messiah*, yet if we believe not also what *that Person is*, in whom the Office of Mediator resides, we shall understand very little of its Nature, Dignity, and Efficacy. To believe Christ to be Anointed, signifies very little unless we understand also *who it is* that is so Anointed. (5.) To believe that God raised Christ from the Dead, doth the same:

same: Doth the same? the same what? Why, it
 includes a general Belief of the Gospel, because his
 Resurrection was the last, and great Confirmation of the
 Gospel. Let us now put all this together: We are
 said to be justified by believing that God raised up Christ
 from the Dead, and that signifies the same with being
 justified by the Blood of Christ: and both these sig-
 nify to be justified by believing and obeying the Gospel:;
 and yet to believe that God raised up Christ from the
 Dead includes only a general belief of the Gospel: In
 all which there is nothing but what is rotten at the
 Core. 1. Let us examine in what sense we are said
 to be justified by believing that God raised up Christ
 from the Dead. The place assigned is Rom. 10.
 9. If thou shalt confess with thy Mouth, the Lord
 Jesus Christ, and shalt believe in thine Heart that God
 has raised up him from the Dead, thou shalt be saved.
 Where Salvation is not promised to a Belief of this
 Proposition, That God raised Christ from the Dead,
 but to a Believing it with the Heart: such a Faith as
 does with the Redeemer included in that Proposition,
 is evident from the Faith of Thomas, Joh. 20, 28.
 Our Lord Jesus willing to satisfy his doubts and
 scruples about the Truth of his Resurrection, shews
 him his Hands and Feet, gives him leave to put his
 Hand into the Print of the Nails, and the Hole of his
 Side: upon this he is satisfied and expresses the Be-
 lief of his Heart in these words, My Lord and my
 God. When therefore the Apostle tells us, That
 by believing with the Heart that God has raised Jesus
 from the Dead, we shall be saved, he intends such a
 Faith, as accepts of, and gives up the Soul mutually
 to a Redeemer as its own God and Lord: and not a
 general Belief that Christ must needs be the Messiah,
 be-

because he was raised from the Dead; and if the Messiah his Doctrine must needs be true, be it what it will, though we know nothing of it. 2. It may be enquired whether such a general Belief that God raised up Jesus from the Dead, be a true justifying Faith? If it be: An *Implicite Faith* will serve turn for all the Particulars of the Gospel; and this would save abundance of needless pains that men take in reading of, meditating upon the Scriptures: and now instead of the *Colliers Faith*, who believed as the Church believed, at all adventures, right or wrong, he has introduced another full as easie, *The Belief of the Resurrection of Christ from the Dead*: A Faith happily contrived for the Genius of this sparing Age, which saves us two parts in three of Christ's Offices, and eleven parts in twelve of our very Creed. 3. Let it be modestly examined also, whether To be justified through Faith in the Blood of Christ, and to be justified by believing that God raised up Christ from the Dead, be expressions of the same importance? If they be: then we may be said to be reconciled to God by the Resurrection, and that Christ in being raised from the Dead, was made sin for us, a Sacrifice for sin; and it's something strange that none of the Apostles could hit upon such expressions as might recommend them, and their writings to our Author's Charity. 4. Let it be considered also, whether Christ's Resurrection was the last Argument he gave to confirm the Truth of the Gospel: I think his visible Appearance to his Disciples after his Resurrection, and those Miraculous Operations he then put forth; his Ascension into Heaven, whilst his Disciples looked on; his pouring out the Spirit upon the Apostles, enabling them to speak with Tongues,

gues, his empowering them to work Miracles many years after his Resurrection and Ascension, were all Confirmations of the Truth of his Gospel, and all subsequent to his Resurrection. 5. Let it have a place in our Thoughts too; seeing Christ's Resurrection was the great Confirmation of his Doctrine, without which all the rest, and especially his Death, had been no Confirmation of it, and yet Atonement, Propitiation, Reconciliation, Redemption are not ascribed to it, whether the Death of Christ, to which all these are ascribed, have an Influence upon our Acceptance with God, only as it confirms his Doctrine? It is strange that the Apostles should word matters so crossly, to attribute those things to the Death of Christ, which do most properly belong to the Resurrection, and those things to the Resurrection which do most properly belong to his Death. And all-out as strange that our Author should make such a noise with Atonement, Reconciliation, Redemption, and ascribe all these to his Death, when-as upon the sole Reason of his Ascribing them to that Death, they are much more rationally applicable to his Resurrection. There are some well-meaning Souls no doubt that have read our Author's Book, who finding such Glorious things ascribed to the Death of Christ: Justification by his Blood, Redemption by his Blood, Reconciliation by his Blood, lift up their Eyes and cry out, What pity it is that such a sweet young Gentleman that has written such a precious Piece, of Union, Communion, Sacrifice, Atonement, Redemption, and Reconciliation, stult so full with Orthodox Propositions, should be taken upon suspicion for a Socinian? and yet when we come to scan these fine words, they prove nothing but a com-

company of sweet Flowers stuck about his Dead Body: And to be justified by Faith in the Blood of Christ, is no more but to believe that Christ is a Prophet sent to reveal God's Will to us. The Conclusion of the whole Matter then will be this: If the Death of Christ has no other influence upon our Acceptance with God, but that it confirms to us this Truth, That God will pardon and save them that believe and obey the Gospel, it has no influence at all upon God for that End; for which I refer my self to the Reader, and the Reader to the foregoing Discourse.

He goes on: Hence it is also that the Apostles attribute such things to the Blood of Christ, as are the proper, and immediate Effects of the Gospel-Covenant, and therefore all the Blessings of the Gospel are owing to the Blood of Christ, because the Gospel-Covenant itself was procured and confirmed by the Blood of Christ. I am now perfectly cured of my Ambition to be one of the Corporation of your Rational Divines: and if this be Reason, I do by these presents renounce it for ever. Here are two words, [Hence] and [Therefore] which always pretend to inference, and conclusion: I shall examine how well they make good their Pretences. First [Hence] I pray whence? Out of what Premises is this Conclusion deduced? That the Apostles attribute such things to the Blood of Christ, as are the Proper and Immediate Effects of the Gospel-Covenant? Let us look back as far as fairly we may. To be justified by Faith, by the Faith of Christ, by Christ, by his Blood, &c. signify one and the same thing: and Hence it is that the Apostles attribute such things to the Blood of Christ, &c. And really turn it quite backwards and it will conclude as strongly. The

Apo-

Apostles attribute such things as the Blood of Christ, as are the proper and immediate Effects of the Gospel Covenant: and hence it is, that To be justified by Faith, by the Faith of Christ, by Christ, by his Blood, &c. signify one and the same thing. Now when he can once bring matters into this Posture he is safe, and out of the Gun-ther of Reply, for which way soever you come to attack him, you must deny the Conclusion. But let us leave out the [Hence,] and consider the words absolutely. The Apostles attribute such things as the Blood of Christ as are the proper and immediate Effects of the Gospel-Covenant: To which I answer: 1. It's just as easie for another (if he had but a Licence) to say, The Apostles attribute such things as the Gospel-Covenant, as are the proper and immediate Effects of the Blood of Christ; and with better Reason, because whatever acceptation our Services and Duties, our Repentance and Obedience find with God, is clearly assigned to the Blood of Christ. But 2. This is a foul scandalous slander which he throws upon the Apostles; they give to the Blood of Christ its own proper and immediate Effects: they rob not Repentance and Obedience to adorn the Sacrifice of Christ with borrowed Plumes. They give to Christ the things that are Christ's; and to Faith, Baptism; and Obedience the things that are Theirs. They ascribe our Redemption to the Blood of Christ, as a proper Price paid to God; and they ascribe to Faith its own Efficiency to interest us in the Benefits of that Redemption. They ascribe Reconciliation to the Blood of Christ, as its immediate & proper Effect, without any intervening Act of the Creature for that End; and they ascribe to Faith, Repentance, and Obedience their proper and immedi-

ate

ate Concerns, to put us into the actual and full Possession of all the Fruits of that Reconciliation made with God: They attribute Pardon of Sin to the Blood of Christ, who was made sin for us, an expiatory Sacrifice to remove guilt, that is, the Obligation of the Sinner to punishment; and they attribute the Application of that Pardon unto Individuals, unto Faith, as that whereby we receive Christ and all his Benefits. 3. If these be the proper and immediate Effects of the Covenant, and not of the Blood of Christ: What should move the Apostles always to speak improperly, to affix Reconciliation, Atonement, Redemption, &c. to the Blood of Christ, and never to our Obedience? when yet we are neither properly reconciled, properly redeemed, nor God properly atoned by Christ's Blood, but all these are the proper Effects of our Obedience.

And now one word to the [Therefore] And therefore (says he) All the Blessings of the Gospel are owing to the Blood of Christ, because the Gospel-Covenant it self was procured, and confirmed by the Blood of Christ: A very learned Argument! that is to say, We owe the Blessings of the Gospel to that which is no true and proper cause of them. The Blood of Christ is not the proper Cause of our Justification, therefore we owe our Justification to it: His Blood is not the proper Cause of our Reconciliation, and therefore we are indebted to his Blood for our Reconciliation. All Effects are owing to their proper Causes; whatsoever therefore is the proper Cause of our Justification, to that we are indebted for it: But how naturally would this Conclusion follow from his Premise? The Blood of Christ is not the proper Cause of Justification, Reconciliation, and Redemption; and therefore we do

do not owe our Justification, Reconciliation, and Redemption to the Blood of Christ: Or thus, We owe all the Blessings of the Gospel to the Blood of Christ, and therefore the Blood of Christ is the proper Cause of these Blessings.

And now let the Reader observe, how his Reason brought up in the Rear, has routed his Reason that marched in the Van. The Blood of Christ is not the proper Cause of the Blessings of the Gospel: there's your Reason in the Front, why we do not owe the Blessings of the Gospel to it. And again: The Gospel-Covenant was procured and confirmed by it: There's your Reason in the Rear, why we do owe the Blessings of the Gospel to it.

But to do our Author justice, I shall look over these things more severely. The Gospel-Covenant it self (says he) was procured by the Blood of Christ. And does not this sound more honourably for the Blood of Christ, than to say it only confirm'd a Covenant? To procure (if we might measure the import of the Word by its sound) implies that the Blood of Christ had some Influence upon God, that moved him to enter into such a Covenant with Mankind, which without that Consideration he had never done: but to confirm a Covenant, that supposes there was such a Covenant in being, only the Blood of Christ gave security to Men that it should be made good: So that if we know when we are well, we had best keep ourselves so, and sit down contented with this New-Humour and Efficiency ascribed to the Blood of Christ, that it procured as well as confirmed the Gospel-Covenant; lest whilst we labour to engross more than is due, we lose what the Charity of our Author has given us: But they who think they have right to All, will hardly be persuaded to be put off with

R r

half;

half; and therefore I must a little further enquire into this new-start-up Notion of procuring the Covenant. What this Gospel-Covenant is, which our Author so frankly attributes to the Procurement of Christ's Blood, he has told us p. 320. *A Promise of the Pardon of Sin, and Eternal Life to those who believe, and obey the Gospel*: I confess a clear and distinct Notion of what he calls Gospel, would very much befriend us in our Enquiry: The best I can find, (and it's but a half-faced one neither) is p. 34. *To preach Christ* (says he) *is to preach his Gospel*, that is, *to expound all those Rules of Life, and Articles of Faith, which are contained in it*: Whether this be Gospel or no I shall not enquire, or whether this be the Covenant of the Gospel I shall not torment him with; but this is that which Christ has procured for us with his Blood, *A Promise of Pardon, and Life to those who believe, and obey all that's revealed and commanded, either in the Scriptures, or the New-Testament, or the Four Evangelists, or in one of Christ's Sermons*, (I think that must be it.) Now I must here entreat the Reader to open his Eyes and see how he has been cheated all this while. (1.) It's very well known he propounded a Question at first, *What Influence the Righteousness of Christ's Life, and the Sacrifice of his Death have upon our Acceptance with God*: To this he answers separately concerning the Death of Christ and its Influence; and will come all in good time to shew us, *What Influence the Righteousness of his Life hath upon God for that End*. Concerning the Influence of his Death, he has been perswading us that it confirms the Covenant; and now in the Close he has stoll'n-in a Word we never dreamt of, that it procures this Covenant: Now I suspect some fraud; for *what Influence has the Death of Christ upon*

upon God to procure us such a *Compassion*? Had he shew'd us *this*, he had deserved better of his Readers, than by all this Amusing Sophistry.

(2.) He has told us, p. 42. *That the Light of Nature, the Works of Creation and Providence do assure us, that God designs the Happiness of all his Creatures according to their Capacities; (and they are capable of being justified and saved): And that God is so Holy, that he has a Natural Love for all good Men, and is as ready to pardon them when they return to their Duty, as a kind Father is to receive a Humble, and Penitent Prodigal: And p. 43. Had Christ never appeared in the World, yet we had reason to believe that God is thus good and merciful. Now having such good security from the Light of Nature, Reason being clear in the Point, and the thing so natural, and essential to God, that he will pardon, and is ready to it, upon Repentance and Obedience, though Christ had never appear'd; what has the Death of Christ done, to procure this Favour or more Favour from God? We will grant that the Death of Christ has confirmed the Truth of it more, but what has it added to the Procurement of the thing? If it be said that Christ's Death did not procure a Willingness in God to Pardon, but only a Confirmation of his Willingness: I would ask what greater Confirmation a rational Creature could well desire, than an Assurance from the Light of Nature, that this was Natural and Essential to God? And I would further know, what the Procuring of a Confirmation amounts to more than a Confirmation? (3.) The Scripture has assured us, Gen. 17. That God gave an explicate Promise to Abraham, that he would be his God, or a God to him: that is, that whatever Abraham should want, and yet could not want but he must be eternally miserable*

able, that thing God would be to him: For 'tis an uncouth Interpretation of the Promises: I will be thy God, that is, I will be working to thee, do nothing for thee, of what thou mainly wantest; but for all my Promise, to be thy God, I will suffer thee to be under the guilt of Sin at present, and to fall under eternal Condemnation hereafter: though thou walkest before me, and art perfect. If then there was such an Implicit and Virtual Promise in God's Nature, revealed by the works of Creation and Providence to Reason; and an Explicit one too in the particular Revelation, that God would bestow Pardon of Sin and Eternal Life to those who walk before God in uprightness: The Question is, How did Christ procure such an Engagement from God, when it was procured before? But supposing that there was never any such Promise made by God till Christ by his Death procured it: then how did the Death of Christ prevail with God to make such a Promise, which otherwise he had never made? (4.) But I suspect more than ever, that we are merely gulled: for he tells us, That the Blessings of the Gospel are the proper fruits of the Covenant, but not of that Blood of Christ: so that we are justified by the Blood of Christ, is properly false, but improperly true, that we are Redeemed by the Blood of Christ, in an improper Sense, may be said to be true, but in a proper Sense is utterly false; and then if the Apostles had penn'd their Epistles clean backward, they would have been properly true, whereas now they are properly false: And now who can tell but when he says (The Blood of Christ procured this Covenant, he may not mean in some improper odd Sense that is not worthy a Button?

But yet our Author seems to go higher than all this, p. 330. Our Righteousness and acceptance with God

God is wholly owing to the Covenant, which he hath purchased & sealed with his Blood. To Purchase is a very good word when applied to the Blood of Christ & therefore because we meet with so few I shall make as much of it as I can: It denotes procurement in a special way by a valuable price paid. The Covenant of Grace then Christ has purchased: that Covenant is a Promise of Pardon and Life to those who believe and obey the Gospel. In this Covenant there are three things. First, the Material part, the pardon of sin, and eternal Life. Secondly, the conditional part, Faith and Obedience. Thirdly, The form of the Covenant, a Promise of the Material part upon performance of the Conditional part. Now when he owns the Blood of Christ to have purchased this Covenant: the question is, whether the whole or some part of it only? If not the whole, then what part is the purchase of his Blood? 1. For the Conditional part, Faith and Obedience, I may secure my self; our Author will not put them into the particular of the purchase: for then it would be scarce worth the while to mingle Heaven and Earth with Tragedies, what the conditions of the Covenant should be if Christ had purchased the conditions themselves, and therefore as to these, let every man trust to himself. 2. As for the Material part, Pardon, and Life. I doubt our Author will not yield us neither that Christ has purchased them, because he denies that the Blessings of the Gospel are the proper effects of Christ's Blood: whereas had he purchased them with his Blood they would have been the proper effects of it. 3. There remains, that Christ has purchased a Promise of bestowing the Material part, upon our performance of the Conditional part: And thus we are just where we were two miles ago, and these great words of

purchasing and procuring are shew'd up to Confirmation of a Promise; but if he will say that the Blood of Christ, his Death, and dreadful sufferings were a proper price paid to God, to procure or purchase a word from God that he would do that which was natural and essential to him, then we shall thank him, that he has such honourable thoughts of it, as to judge it worth a good word. The Scripture every-where ascribes the Blessings of the Gospel to the purchase and procurement of the Blood of Christ; but if this be all, that he has got a word from God, it supposes the the Scripture to swell with Scenical Language, and high Tragical Phrase; which seems to carry sublime matters in it, but when it comes to be stript of Metaphor and Allegory is a mere Anatomy. From this precarious Hypothesis that the Apostles always write like himself, that is, improperly and impertinently, and attribute such things to the Blood of Christ which are the proper and immediate effects of the Gospel-Covenant, he will unriddle to us many Mysteries which are vulgarly reputed matters of weight and worth; but if we can spare him a little Patience, he will so uncase them, that we shall confess, they contain nothing that may deserve or need the Blood of Christ, or any great matter to be made about them. [1.] Concerning Reconciliation; The Apostle had said, 2 Cor. 5. 18, 19. All things are of God, who hath reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ, and hath committed to us the Ministry of reconciliation, to wit, that God was in Christ, reconciling the World unto himself, and imputing their Trespases, and hath committed to us the word of reconciliation, v. 21. For he hath made him to be sin for us: what the import of καταλλάγειν, reconciliation, and καταλλάσσω, to reconcile, is, will not create us any great trouble, be-
 cause

cause our Author allowing a reconciliation to be made between Jew and Gentile, secretly confesses that Reconciliation implies the taking away of an enmity, and bringing the differing parties into a state of Peace and Friendship. But the Apostle in this place instructs us further: 1. That the proper effect of this Reconciliation is [not-imputing Trespases]. God is by Nature a Holy God; as he is Governour of the World, he is a Righteous Judge; sin is both Contrary to his holy Nature, and his Holy Law: And therefore as a Holy God, he cannot but hate sin; as a Righteous Judge he cannot but punish sin: And because this sin is inherent in, and committed by Man; God hates the sinner upon the Account of his sin; his Person and his best services, are an abomination to the Lord. From hence it follows, that sin being a transgression of the Law, in its preceptive part, renders the sinner Guilty, that is, obnoxious and liable to the Law in its Sanction, to the punishment. Now this Righteous Judge will certainly charge the guilty sinner with the penalty due to his sin; but there is a way found out that he may be reconciled, and not impute to sinners their Trespases: and this clearly shews that the Reconciliation here spoken of, is a reconciliation of God to the Sinner; such a one as makes provision that God shall not impute iniquity. 2. The Apostle instructs us further in the way whereby Christ made this Reconciliation of God, v. 21. He was made sin for us; that is, he was constituted to be a sin-offering, upon whom the Guilt and Punishment of our sin being laid, the great obstructions to Reconciliation, God's Justice and Holy Law, being removed (by being satisfied), a way is cleared for a new Peace with God. And the Apostle as hath been observed, cites this from Isa. 53. 10. When he shall make his Soul an offering for sin the

the same word signifying both *sin*, and *sin-Offering*.
 3. That the *Preaching of this Reconciliation made with God*, to the World, was committed to the Ministers of the Gospel, that they as Ambassadors from God, might treat with them also about their being reconciled to God; which farther evinces a *mutual Enmity*, and a *mutual Reconciliation*; that God reconciled the World to himself by Jesus Christ, whom God made to be sin, for that great end, and then established a Ministry to Preach the Doctrine to the Sons of Men, and to deal with them in the Name of Christ, that they would also lay aside their Malignity, and accept of the Reconciliation procured by the Blood of Jesus: Now this Reconciliation made with God respects the *Gentiles and Jews equally*; for some might plead that it was the *peculiar privilege of the Jews*, as being the only Church of God, to enjoy the benefit of *propitiating Sacrificers*: others might think to do the Jews a kindness in pleading that Reconciliation only belonged to the *Gentiles*, for they alone were *Enemies to God*, and therefore they only needed it; but the Apostle assures us that *Jews as well as Gentiles had need of a Mediator of Reconciliation*, and that *Gentiles as well as Jews had a share in the Grace, and mercy of it*: God was in Christ reconciling the World to himself. Thus the Apostle Eph. 2. 13. But now in Christ Jesus ye who sometimes were afar off, are made nigh by the Blood of Christ. v. 16. And that he might reconcile both unto God in one Body by the Cross. Now here our Author meets us with a window open into his Soul, that we may see the Pulse of his heart, and what he understands by Christ's reconciling the World to God. That is (says he) the *Gentiles were received into the fellowship of God's Church, and the Jews*

Jews and Gentiles united in one Body or Society.
 Some that were strangers to our Author's Sentiments would greedily ask, what was *that great quarrel* between Jews and Gentiles, that God must send his only begotten Son, out of his Bosom to dye a most bitter, violent, painful, lingering, cursed Death, to take it up? That he must *be made sin*, have *Iniquities charged upon him*, to make them friends? That there have been Wars, and Contentions betwixt the *Jews and their Neighbours*, Histories both sacred and prophane, abundantly testify; there are such amongst most Neighbouring Nations: But shall we think that God will send his Son into the World to compose all the bickerings that ever were in the World? But suppose, there had been a Necessity of it, was the feud so inveterate that nothing but the Death of him that came to make Peace could take it away? must every Man dye a *Cursed Death* that comes to make up a breach between two wrangling Neighbours or Nations? few would be ambitious to be Plenipotentiaries upon such Terms. It is true, there was a difference or distinction set up by God himself, between the Jews and the rest of the World, but *no quarrel or enmity* put between them: But then, 1. The Gentiles had Liberty to become *Profelytes* of Righteousness, and then the union had been made, the Ceremonial Law still standing in force. 2. God could easily have taken down the *Partition Wall*, and laid the Church open from the enclosure; there was a Time when there was none of that discriminating Dispensation, and he that set it up could have abrogated, and repealed it, without such a dreadful way of giving his only Son to be *Made first Man*, and then *Sin*, and then a *Curse*. It seems

seems strange that God should first Create a necessity of a quarrel; and then put his Son upon a necessity to remove it at so dear a price as his own Blood.

3. If our Author was once Ith right, there was no great need of removing these Ceremonies, for (says he) p. 29. *The rest of the World might when they pleased fetch the best Rules of Life, and the most certain notices of the Divine Will from the Jews; so long then as they might have a fairer Copy of their Moral-Law, they needed not be beholden to them for their Ceremonies.* But the bottom of the business is this and no other: The Scripture is most express that Christ is said to reconcile us to God by his Blood, by his Death, &c it would be a burning shame to deny it: What is then to be done? First, it's resolved on, that it's not to be endured, that any of the Blessings of the Gospel be allowed the proper effects of his Death or Blood; why then, some wholesome expedient must be found out that the expression may be owned, and yet the thing is self rejected: And the best that can be thought on at present is this, To imagine a most terrible War between Jews and Gentiles, upon the Account of Ceremonies; such as set the whole World on a Flame, and involved all Mankind in the dreadful Combustion; not a single Person in all the World but sided in with one of the parties: And now if we could but be Masters of so much Confidence as to say that Christ came, and dyed, and was made a Curse to make these two Parties friends, there would be something that might be called Reconciliation. Now upon a serious view of the premises, it was observed, that the Jews had some marks of distinction whereby they were privileged above, and differenced from the rest of Mankind: Now a difference you know sometimes signifies a Quarrel, which

which fell out as luckily as heart could wish; and therefore these tokens of difference shall be called *Enmity*, and Christ's taking away this difference, shall be called the removing of the *Enmity*, and by Consequence, *Reconciliation*: yes, there it must go, if anywhere: for I see and am glad to see it, that our Author is willing to carry some fair Correspondency, and not to fall out flat with the Death of Christ. Now (says he) *This Union of Jews and Gentiles is owing to the Gospel which takes away all marks of distinction; and gives them both equal rights to the Blessings of the New-Covenant.* But, 1. To what purpose was the *Enmity* removed between Jew and Gentile, if the *Enmity* of God against both had not been removed; all Union on Earth without Peace, without Heaven, is but a wicked confederacy. 2. The Jews as well as Gentiles are said to be reconciled. Now what-ever grudge the Gentiles might have against the Jews, yet the Jews had no Cause of any against the poor Gentiles; did they envy them, their darkness, and blindness, and Alienation from their Common-Wealth? 3. They must both be reconciled to God; and what did the removal of Ceremonies contribute to that end? But (says he) *This New-Covenant belongs to all Mankind, to Gentiles as well as Jews, there's now no distinction of Persons, no Man is ever the more or less acceptable to God because he is a Jew or a Greek: very true! I wonder when ever it was otherwise! Our Author could have Answered himself from p. 27. Those particular favours that God bestowed on Israel: were not owing to any partial fondness, and respect to that People, but the design of all was, to encourage the whole World to Worship the God of Israel; And that the Jews were not accepted for their Ceremonial Services, we may easily believe, if we can but believe*
what

what he tells us, Pag. 269. *The Law of Moses raised them up in a ritual and external Religion; taught them to Worship God in the Letter by Circumcisions, Sacrifices, and an external Conformity to the Letter of the Law; but the Gospel alone teaches us to worship God with the Spirit, to offer a reasonable Service to him.* And if he can but assure me that the Gentiles were never the less accepted of God, because they were Gentiles; I dare give him my Warrant, that the Jews were never the more accepted of God for their Judaism, according to those Measures which our Author has given of their Religion, which it seems was mere Paganry. [2.] Concerning Redemption, he acquaints us what it signifies, both to Jews and Gentiles. (1.) As to the Jews: They (says he) are said to be redeemed from the Curse of the Law, by the accursed Death of Christ upon the Cross, Gal. 3. 13. Because the Death of Christ put an end to that legal Dispensation, and sealed a New, and better Covenant between God and Man. It's well he could find any thing small enough to be the proper and immediate effect of the Death of Christ; but who shall reconcile the Apostle and our Author? The Apostle says, Christ redeemed them by being made a Curse for them; Our Author says, No, he only put an end to that Legal Dispensation: The Apostle says, they were redeemed by a price paid, ἡγορασέν, He brought them out with a price, which he expresses in words at length, 1 Cor. 6. 20. ἡγορασθε τιμῇς; Ye are bought with a price: No, says he, Christ's Death put an end to that legal Dispensation. The Apostle says, they were redeemed, ὡς τῆς κατάρσεως; from under the Curse: No, says he, 'twas only a freedom from the legal Dispensation. Two suppositions he makes use of to give a Colour to his matters.

§. 1. That

1. *Selt.* That the Jews were under no other Curse, but that of the Ceremonial Law. Now, 1. He should have been sure that the Ceremonial Law was a Curse: It's a wonder to me, what grievous sins the Jews above all the World should commit, that God should put them under such a Curse, as should need the Death of Christ to redeem them from it; especially what great Crimes had Abraham been guilty of, that God should thus Curse and plague him with Circumcision, which yet the Scripture calls the Seal of the Righteous Faith, Rom. 4. 11. 2. It would be considered whether ever God gave a Law to any People in the World besides them, that in its own Nature was a Curse? Our Author once told us, p. 196. That it pleased God to institute a great many Ceremonies in the Jewish Worship, to awe their Childish minds into a greater Veneration of the Divine Majesty. And truly, better so than worse; better be frightened into Obedience, than not at all Obedient: But that ever God designed it for a Curse is past my apprehension. 3. The Ceremonial Law in its constitution, end, and design, was a great Blessing: there they had Pardon of sin, Atonement, Reconciliation exhibited, and sealed to them, Lev. 17. 11. 2 Chron. 29. And all this could be no curse, but to those who loved their sins better than the pardon of them, and to such every Blessing of God would eventually prove a Curse. 4. It will appear they were under a greater curse than what arose from the burdensomeness, or their violation of the Ceremonial Law, viz. That Condemnation which came upon all Men by the Fall of Adam, Rom. 5. 12, 13, 14. 17, 18, 19. Such a Curse as was Common not only to Jew and Gentile, but to every individual un-

S f

der

der both capacities, Rom. 3. 9. *We have proved, both Jews, and Gentiles, that they are all under sin, ver. 19. That every mouth may be stopped, and all the World become guilty before God, ver. 23. For all have sinned, and come short of the Glory of God, And therefore all had need of free justification by Grace, through the Redemption that is in Jesus Christ, ver. 24.* 5. The Jews were under a curse upon the Account of their violation of the *Moral Law*, and their not duly attending to the true ends of the Ceremonial Law; but if the violation of a Law would make it become a curse, then the *Moral Law* was become a curse too; and then they had need of a Redeemer from the one as well as the other, though both were blessings in themselves. The Ceremonial Law in particular had this great blessing in it: That as it discovered to them the demerit, and Wages of sin, in the slaying of the Sacrifices; so it discovered a remedy too, in the Sacrifices slain for them, which directed them to look through them, beyond them, and above them, to him who was the Lamb of God slain from the Foundation of the World: All this was no curse.

2. *Sett.* He supposes that the Text, Gal. 3. 13. *Christ hath Redeemed us from the curse of the Law, being made a curse for us*, relates onely to the Jews: Whereas the Apostle adds to obviate that Cavil, *That the Blessing of Abraham might come upon the Gentiles: Christ is made a curse for them* upon whom the Blessing of Abraham came by his Death; but the Blessing of Abraham came upon the Gentiles by his Death; therefore Christ is made a Curse for the Gentiles. And that the Law from the curse whereof both Jews and Gentiles were Redeemed by Christs being made a Curse for them, is the *Moral Law*;

I have endeavoured to evince in the last Section, but whether to our Authors content or no I know not! One thing more he supposes, that *Christs Sealing a New Covenant is Redemption*: But there must go more than the sealing of such a Covenant as he has described: There must be the payment of a Price to Justice, or there can be no Redemption: To Redeem, is properly to buy back again, that which was forfeited, and such were Sinners: Their Persons forfeited to Justice, their Merits escheated into the hands of the Law; Now comes a Redeemer and gives himself to God as a λύτρον ἢ ἀντίλυτρον, a Counter-price, a valuable Consideration, to Answer the demands of Justice, and the claims of the Law; and this is something more than abolishing Ceremonies, or Sealing a Covenant; but if our Author can contrive a way of Redeeming and Purchasing by Paper, Parchment, and Wax, by Sealing Covenants without paying down a valuable consideration, he will highly oblige this present Age to read his Book, which is more studious to purchase this world, than about the deliverance of their Souls from present Curse, and future wrath, by the blood of a Redeemer.

(2) As for the Gentiles he acquaints us next, from 1 Pet. i. 18. how they were Redeemed. *Ye were not Redeemed with corruptible things, as Silver and Gold from your vain Conversation received by Tradition from your Fathers, but with the precious blood of Christ us of a Lamb without blemish, and without spot.* In which words the Apostle evidently shews, That look what place Silver and Gold do hold in the Redemption of Persons, or things that are Legally under seizure, the same does the blood of

Christ obtain in the Redemption of sinners: Christ's blood was not indeed a corruptible price, like Silver and Gold; yet it was a price, a proper price, though not a corruptible price, and has the same Office with another price, if we may compare small things and great: and in that he excepts the corruptibility of this price, he establishes the parallel in the other particulars, Exceptio in non exceptis firmat regulam. And he gives us further light into this Affair from that expression *τιμὴ ἀγία*, with the precious blood of Christ; or that blood which is a price. So the Apostle Paul, 1 Cor. 6. 20. *ἡμεῖς ἀγοράσμεθα*. *We are bought with a Price:* And yet further: That the blood of Christ, that is Christ by dying, is this Price; which is evident in that he compares Christ himself, to the Sacrifices of Atonement, and Expiation, where the Lamb chosen out for that Service, was to be without spot and blemish. And thus the Apostle Paul conspires with his beloved Brother Peter, 1 Tim. 2. 6. *Who gave himself a Ransom for all;* ἀντάνατον ὑπὲρ πάντων. Now if *ἀντάνατον* & ἀντάνατον ὑπὲρ: will not evince a proper price paid by way of Ransom for another, we must despair of ever expressing Truth with that clearness, but it shall be lyable to mis-construction, by the possibility of another meaning; and it's in vain to seek a Remedy against that evil, for which there's no Help in Nature. But let us now hear our Authors Apprehensions about these things. "The Gentiles (*says he*) "were delivered from Idolatry by the Preaching of "the Gospel, which is called their being Redeemed "by the blood of Christ, because we owe this unspeakable Blessing to his Death. Here are several things which he asserts, and takes for granted.

1. *Self.*

1. 1. Sect. That the Apostle speaks here *only of the Redemption of the Gentiles, not of the Jews.* A Fancy so idle, that nothing but an absolute necessity to preserve the Life of his Cause could justify in Hunger (we say) will break through stone walls; extremity taught Mariners that use of Jurg-Masts, and such pinching Scriptures have made men rack their wits for evasions: That this Epistle was primarily written to the Jews of the *Asian Synagogue* we need not vouch *Sediger* to prove, c. 1. v. 1. puts it out of doubt. To the strangers scattered through *Pontus, &c.* which the Apostle *James, Chap. 1. ver. 1.* expresses; To the twelve Tribes scattered abroad: His pressing them with the Authority of the Prophets, his alluding to *Old Testament-worship, Ordinances, Customs;* His urging them with the example of *Sarah,* do clearly prove it, besides his Exhortation, *Ch. 2. v. 12.* To have their conversation honest amongst the Gentiles, evidently distinguishes them to whom he wrote, from the Gentiles amongst whom they dwelt; and yet because of the Communion that was between the believing Jews, and believing Gentiles, there are some passages in this Epistle that respect them also: But still the primary intendment of the Epistle was to the Jews, which one thing destroys all that goddly superstructure that he has raised upon this supposition that the Apostle here speaks of the Redemption of the Gentiles only.

2. Sect. He supposes that *Redemption* signifies no more than deliverance in general; whereas the Redemption here mentioned is a special way of deliverance by a price paid. As silver and gold are used in the Redemption of Captives, so is the blood of Christ

in the Redemption of Sinners; but Silver and Gold are paid as a Price for the Redemption of Captives, therefore so is the Blood of Christ. Now, what is that which in our Authors *New Model* of Redemption by Christ, Answers; the Silver and Gold in the Redemption of Captives? As the Redemption by Price is always Seconded with deliverance by Power; so deliverance by Power presupposes Antecedent Redemption by Price. But here it is commonly Objected, That if the Blood of Christ be a proper Price, then it ought to be paid to the Devil; the world; or Sin, for these held the Sinner in Captivity. To which I Answer, true; if Satan detained the Sinner Prisoner in his own right, if Souls were his own proper spoils, acquired by right of War, or otherwise; but the Devil is only an Officer of Divine Justice, a Goaler, and Executioner of the Sentence of the Law; The World may pass for one of his Under-Keepers. As for sin that's the bondage and slavery it self. If then God be satisfied, in whose right, as the great Law-giver, and Governour, these Sinners are held in bondage, though Satan repine, and gnash his Teeth, he must quit his Prey and Prisoners. It is said again, that then upon the payment of the price to God, the sinner is immediately set free: But no Reason compels us to Argue so; for the Price of Redemption being not paid to God by Man himself, but a third Person, a Mediator between them both: It's not onely convenient, but absolutely necessary, that he submit to such Terms as shall be agreed upon between God and the Mediator, that he may actually enter upon the benefits of that Price paid: Besides, it's necessary he should be so qualified as to Glorifie both the Redeemer, and the free-grace of that God that

that accepted a Redeemer; and there are many of the greatest benefits of Redemption that would signify nothing to the sinner if it were possible to imagine him invested with them, without a previous change in his Nature, enabling him to enjoy them: But yet it will be said, and is said by others of our Authors Judgment, who have managed these things with a greater appearance of cunning than himself: That however then, *this Price should have been paid to God*, which (say they) it was not; but we are confident that it was, 1 Tim. 1. 5, 6. *There is one God, and one Mediator between God and Man, the Man Christ Jesus, who gave himself a price of Redemption for all.* Now, if Christ gave himself as a price of Redemption as Mediator between God and Man, he must either give it to God, or Man, (for as Mediator he stands onely between these two Parties.) How absurd it is that he should pay it to Man, needs not many words to evince; it remains therefore that he paid it to God himself: But the Apostle Peter puts that out of dispute in the place under consideration: For he tells us, that we were Redeemed by the blood of Christ, as of a Lamb without blemish, and without spot; whence it appears, that Christ was the true Sacrifice chosen by God, immaculate, to be the real sin-offering; and that he was Offered to God as the Lamb was.

3. *Self.* Our Author supposes, that all that the Gentiles were Redeemed from was *some gross sins*; he instances onely in Idolatry, but we favourably allow him to include all Actual sins; and yet he comes not up to the design of Christ in Redemption: The vain Conversation received by tradition from their Fathers, *παράδοσις καὶ παράδοσις*; was

St 4

that

that Corruption that they derived by propagation, being by Nature the Children of Wrath even as other Jews and Gentiles being all equally under the Curse and Condemnation of the Law.

4. *Self.* He supposes that we are Redeemed by the Preaching of the Gospel; To which I Answer; That we could never in any sense have been Redeemed by the power of the Gospel Preached, if we had not first been Redeemed by the price of the Blood of Christ paid to God in a proper sense.

5. *Self.* He asserts that Deliverance by Preaching is called Redemption by Christs blood, because we owe this unspeakable blessing to his Death: But how do we owe the Preaching of the Gospel to the Death of Christ? When our Author himself was in such a Huff not long ago with any that should owe a Doctrine as Gospel that was not Preach'd by Christ in his Life. He admired the Sermons of Christ beyond those of the Apostles, and will not allow that his Disciples Believed his Death before he was Crucified; and yet now we owe it all to his Death. As if Moses had not sufficiently confirmed the Truth of his Mission and Doctrine by Miracles, though he never dyed himself to confirm them: And as if Christ had not done the same abundantly, though he had never dyed; Christ sent his Apostles to Preach the Gospel to the Jews, and Preach'd it in his own Person before his Death, and yet of those Jews it's said, *Ye were Redeemed not with Corruptible things, as Silver and Gold, but with the precious Blood of Christ.* But this our Author thinks he has proved from Eph. 2. 15, 16, 17. *Having abolished in his Flesh (by his Death) the enmity, even the Law of Commandments, &c. Came, and Preached Peace to you which were*

were as far off, and so then which were *my*. That
 which he would prove from hence is this: "That
 the Redemption of the Gentile World by the
 Death of Christ, signifies no more than the Revo-
 lving of the Ceremonial Law, and reclaiming them
 from Idolatry and Prophaneity by Preaching the
 Gospel, and then bringing them into one Body or
 Church with the Jews. To make the Text ser-
 viceable to such a design, it was necessary, 1. That
 he should lustily bind over our weaker imagination
 to his own stronger fancy; that by [Flesh] is meant
 the Death of Christ: For my part, I see no neces-
 sity that *Flesh* should signify any more than his As-
 sumption of our Nature; In which Nature he has an-
 swered and fulfilled all the Types and Ceremonies of
 the Law, though in divers ways, and at divers times:
Grace, in which we render to *Abolish*, signifies not
 any formal positive Act, whereby a Law is expressly
 repealed and disannulled; but the rendering a thing
 useless of course, when it's end is attained: Thus
 were all the Ceremonies of the Law rendered *absolute*
 and of none effect, when Christ in the Course of his
 Ministry had answered their design; and particular-
 ly Sacrifices became *useless*, by the Death of Christ,
 those Services, which were *merces* and *no causes*
 in their day, being swallowed up of that greater mer-
 cy of the Death of Christ. 3. He must suppose,
 and that is indeed a reaching supposition, that Christ
 Preaching Peace, is the same thing formally with
 his procuring peace by his Death, than which nothing
 can be imagined *more precarious*; for he first procu-
 red Peace by his Blood; and then Preached that Peace
 which he had procured to Men in his Person, and by
 his Apostles; and therefore, though Christ Preached
 that

that peace to the Jews before he Suffered, yet it was with reference to that peace he should procure by his Sufferings. An eminent instance whereof we have in his Institution, and first Celebration of his last Supper, *Mat. 26. 28.* *This is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed, to in remission, for the Remission of sins;* for though his blood was not yet shed *Actually*, yet in Gods regard, and the Faith of Believers it was considered as shed *Antecedently* to the Remission of sins; for without shedding of blood there is no Remission, *Heb. 9. 22.* And thus was the Blood of Christ considered as shed from the first establishing of the New Covenant, Christ being called *The Lamb slain from the Foundation of the World;* even that Lamb without spot, and blemish, by whose precious Blood Jews and Gentiles were Redeemed.

4. He must suppose too, that the enmity here mentioned is nothing but some bickering that had fallen out between Jew and Gentile about Ceremonies; which the Gentiles that I can find were never very envious at: and then, when he has made all those suppositions, and begged those Postulata's, he will be ready for Demonstration.

A particular consideration of the Text will set that strait which he had made crooked: And 1. The Apostle describes the state of the Gentiles by Nature to be most wretched and miserable, *ver. 12.* *They were Aliens from the Common-wealth of Israel, Strangers from the Covenants of promise, without Christ, having no hope, without God in the World.* They that are without Christ, are without God; and they that are without a promise, are without Christ; and they that are without Covenant, are without promise; and they that are without all these, must needs be without

hope

Their Case must needs be desperate, that have
 no *Christ* to bring them to God; no promise to bring
 them to *Christ*; and if they were Aliens from the
 Church, where the means of Grace were to be had,
 they must needs be without all these. 2. The Apo-
 stle shews the true means whereby the Gentiles were
 brought nigh to God; *Ye who sometimes were afar
 off, are made nigh by the blood of Christ*: It was
Christ's blood alone, by which the great impassable
 gulph was filled up that was between God and his
 Creature by sin; for *Christ is our Peace*. 3. That
 the Gentiles might not Object, that there were ma-
 ny Ceremonial Hedges and Fences that kept them
 off from enjoying the Priviledges of those who were
 reputed the onely Children of God: He removes
 that small Objection, telling them *Christ had already
 removed them in his Flesh, in his Person*; he was the
 same and substance of them: *ὡς αὐτὸν πατρὸς ἡμῶν, καὶ
 ἡμεῖς αὐτὸν τοῦ νόμου τῶν ἐντολῶν*. Having (already)
 in his *Flesh* (or *Person*) made void the Law of Or-
 dinances, and (already) dissolved that Partition
 Wall: He that has Reconciled you to one God, has
 also brought you into one Church, which he repeats
 again, ver. 16. That he might Reconcile both unto
 God, in one Body, by the Cross, having slain the
 Enemy thereby, or in himself is avowed: Here are first,
 the Parties Reconciled, Jews and Gentles; Second-
 ly, to whom they are Reconciled; to God. Thirdly,
 the Fruit of this Reconciliation to God. They are
 brought into one Church amongst themselves. Fourth-
 ly, The Means whereby they are Reconciled to God,
 that so they might be capable of being United into
 one Church, and that is by the Cross of Christ, or
 by himself on the Cross, who bare our sins on the
 Tree.

THE 4. The Apostle shews the way, and manner of promulgating the Peace which he had made with God; and that was by the publick Preaching of the Gospel; yer. 17. He Preached Peace; he made Peace with God, and then Preached it to the Gentile World: He that had procured good will towards men, Preaches Peace on Earth. How little ground now had our Author to say, "That we are said to be Redeemed by the Preaching of the Gospel, when the Preaching of the Gospel is nothing but a Declaration of that Redemption which Christ has made of Jew and Gentile with God, and the way and Method to be partakers of the benefit of it?"

And now to draw to a close of this Matter, let us re-view our Authors Doctrine of Redemption: The Redemption of Jew and Gentile he makes to differ as much as the Faith of Abraham, and that of Christians.

1. They differ in the matter of Redemption, that which they were Redeemed from: The Jews they were Redeemed from the Ceremonial Law, the Gentiles they were Redeemed from Idolatry, and impure practises.

2. They differ in the manner of procurement; for the Jews, Christ (says he) by his Death put an end to that Legal Dispensation; and so their turn is served, that little Redemption that they needed, which is all our Author can afford them, was Actually accomplished by the Death of Christ; which was a proper and immediate cause of their Redemption; (such a one as it was;) but then the Gentiles they were Redeemed after another fashion; by the Preaching of the Gospel, whereby they were turned from Idolatry, and impure practises. - And this shall be called Redemption,

redemption, because it were dangerous to ascribe it to the blood of Christ (for an Obvious Reason that he knows of;) but because the Scripture says we are redeemed by the Blood of Christ, and gives that Blood a concernment therein; therefore to *stop the mouth of the Scripture*, it shall be said, we owe the preaching of the Gospel to the blood of Christ.

[3.] There is one thing more, from whence our Author flatters himself with hopes of great success; and that is by mis-representing the Analogy between the Jewish Sacrifices, and the Sacrifices of Christ: Two things he attempts.

1. To shew what it is under the Law, to which the Death of Christ, his Ascension into Heaven, and presenting his Blood to God, does Answer.

2. What it is under the Law to which his Intercession Answers: Which project of our Authors has been contrived, and managed with a great deal more subtilty by those who would storm, or bluster, to see their Arguments thus miserably abused.

(1.) To the former of these, he expresses himself thus. "Now as the Death of Christ upon the Cross, and his Ascension into Heaven, and presenting his Blood to God in that most Holy place did answer to the first sprinkling of the Blood under the Law, which confirmed the Mosaicall Covenant, as the Apostle Discourses, in Heb. 9. &c. In which few words he has heaped up more absurdities, and follies than another must hope to bring into twice as many. For,

1. Here is a supposition of Christs presenting his Blood to God in Heaven distinct from his Intercession, which when he shall offer to prove, it may be time to consider it.

2. He

2. He supposes that Christs Ascension into Heaven answered the first sprinkling of blood under the Law: A most ridiculous supposition! For what is there in sprinkling that answers to Ascension, or bears the least Analogy to it? Surely these Gentlemen that crowd such parallels, and fancy such uncouth resemblances, must have some mad design in their Heads, which nothing will subserve but such forced allusions: And I do not now wonder that he should so tediously rail at the use of Allusions in others; for they will deserve the most of scorn that can be thrown upon them, if they be all like his own.

3. That the Death of Christ upon the Cross did Answer the sprinkling of Blood under the Law which confirmed the Covenant, is very true: but then,
1. It must be remembered in what respect it confirmed the Covenant, not merely as a witnessing to the Truth of what he has preach'd, but as Answering the demands, and claims of the Governing Justice of God, as we have before shewed. 2. It must be remembered also that it was not such a Covenant as he has imposed upon us, but the true Covenant of Grace, wherein God promises to give that which our Author will not own; the New Heart, New Spirit, and New Obedience. 3. That to confirm a Covenant, was not all the design of it's sprinkling, but diverting of the wrath of God, procuring his favour, &c. So the Blood of Christ has greater ends than confirming of the Truth he taught, viz. the appeasing Gods just displeasure, procuring his Actual Love, pacifying of the Conscience, cleansing the Soul. 4. He supposes also that the Apostle Discourses to this purpose, Rom. 9. which is to make the Apostle accessory to his own groundless fopperies, who is indeed perfectly

perfectly innocent of these crimes. For, 1. The sprinkling of the blood, which the Apostle mentions, Heb. 9. 9. in that mentioned Exod. 24. 6. Now, there was another sprinkling of blood Antecedent to that, which we read of, Exod. 12. to which the blood of Christ did Answer, and to which the Apostle refers, as is evident from Heb. 11. 28. Heb. 12. 24. 2. The sprinkling of Blood, Heb. 9. 19. being the same with that Exod. 24. 6. shews evidently that as the whole concern of the blood sprinkled at that time, was not confirming a Covenant, but Attesting God: So the whole concern of the blood of Christ, is not taken up in confirming a Covenant, much less such a thing as he will mis-call a Covenant, but in Reconciling God to Man, paying a price of Redemption to God, &c. 3. That the Apostle carries another Argument is evident. For, 1. The Typical Interest which those Sacrifices had in Redemption, were accomplish'd before the Blood was carried in to the Holiest place, ver. 12. Neither by the blood of Bulls and Goats, but by his own Blood he entered into the most Holy place, having obtained eternal Redemption: Thus Christ had obtained eternal Redemption, and perfected the whole work of it (as far as the paying of a price to God goes in the Matter) before his Ascension; and that which remained, was the application of the benefit of what he had procured with God, to us, by his prevailing Intercession: And as to the blood of the Sacrifices mentioned, Exod. 24. 6. which the Apostle refers to, ver. 19. which our Author thinks had no other use but the confirming of the Mosaical Covenant, it was never carried into the most Holy place at all, nor the blood of any Propitiatory Sacrifice, but onely that upon the Feast of Expiation

Expiation once a year. 2. The Apostle in this Chapter, does not *only* refer to the sprinkling of the Blood of the Sacrifice, Exod. 24. but to the sprinkling of the blood of the Red Heifer, Numb. 19. 4. Eleazar shall take of her blood (the red Heifer without blemish, and without spot, ver. 2.) and shall sprinkle it directly before the Tabernacle of the Congregation: To which the Apostle expressly refers, *ibid.* 9. 13. If the blood of Bulls and Goats, and the ashes of a Heifer sprinkling the unclean Sanctifieth to the purifying of the Flesh, how much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit Offered himself to God, purge your Consciences from Dead works? And this blood was *never* carried into the Holy place, nor the Ministration of the Service performed by the High-Priest, but by Eleazar: which proves, 1. That the blood of Christ had all its atoning virtue on this side his entrance into Heaven; and 2. That Christ was Typified by the superior Priest, and not by the High-Priest alone: For here not Aaron, but Eleazar performed the Service of the Day. 3. The Apostle clearly Disputes against this Figure of Christ's presenting his blood to God in Heaven, (which the Men of this Heaven, will needs have to be all the Sacrifice that Christ Offered to God) ver. 25, 26. Nor yet that he should Offer himself often, for then he must often have Suffered. No Offering without Suffering: But Christ Suffered but once, therefore he Offered but once. Nay, says the Apostle, Now once in the end of the World hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself. That which Christ did once he does not do always; but if Christs appearing before God in Heaven, be the offering of himself in sacrifice, he does it always to the end of his Mediatory Kingdom. (2) But

(2) But what was it under the Law, to which the Intercession of Christ answers? To this he returns thus: As the Death, &c. so his continual Intercession for us in virtue of his Blood once shed, and once offer'd to God, answers those frequent Expiations by Sacrifice under the Law, especially to that General Sacrifice on the great Day of Expiation, when the High-priest enter'd into the Holy of Holies with the blood of Beasts: As the Death of Christ, his Ascension, and presenting his Blood to God, answers that one, so his Intercession answers the other. Yes indeed, just so, with so much Truth and Regularity of Proportion; that is, with just none at all. What parallel he can fancy between Expiation and Intercession, I cannot divine: This I know,

1. The Expiations by Sacrifice under the Law, were by Blood-shedding; It was the Blood upon the Altar, as the Life of the Sacrifice, that made Expiation, Lev. 17. 11. but in Christs Intercession there is no shedding of Blood.

2. The Expiations by Sacrifice under the Law, were by the Death of the Sacrifice, and so was the Expiation of Christ: And so says our Author too, p. 27. He hath made a perfect Expiation for our sins, by dying once. p. 328. He procures the Pardon of our sins by his Death: But in Heaven there is no Death; and yet he says, *The Intercession of Christ answers the Expiations by Sacrifice under the Law; that is, just as much as Life answers Death:* But how to make our Author friends with the Apostle, will be difficult, who is so hard to be reconciled to himself.

3. The Expiations which were made by the frequent Sacrifices, were all without the Holyest, but

the Intercession of Christ is in the most Holy place : And is not this a famous correspondence ? But how clear is all this, if we could be reconciled to the Scriptures ? Where the Death of Christ upon the Cross, answers all the Expiatory Sacrifices under the Law, and the Intercession of Christ at the right Hand of God, or his appearing continually in Heaven before his Father for us, answers the High-priests entering into the Holy of Holies, with that Blood which had been before shed at the Altar. But whereas such was the imperfection, such the poverty of the Types, that no one was able to Answer all the Concerns of a Sinner, no one could express all the various respects that a guilty Person had to God, and his Law ; and therefore it was necessary that various Sacrifices should be instituted, that they might represent those things *πολυτρόπος* & *πολυτρόπος*, which it was impossible they should perform *πανάδος*, our Lord Jesus Christ by one Offering hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified, Heb. 10. 14. For where Remission is, there is no more Offering for sin, v. 18. When therefore our Author affirms, so secure of Contradiction, That Christ's continual Intercession answers those frequent Expiations under the Law, especially that on the great day of Expiation ; he has said enough to determine this Matter : For if there were frequent Expiations under the Law, besides that of the Feast of Expiation, and that there be any thing in Christ's Sacrifice answering to them ; it follows, that Christ's Expiatory work was finish'd before his entrance into Heaven ; for the Blood of those other Sacrifices never came within the Holy of Holies, which answers to the true Holy Place where Christ makes continual Intercession for us.

All

All this while the Reader ought charitably to believe that our Author is discoursing *what influence the death of Christ bath upon our Acceptation with God*; To which he has answered, that it *Confirms a Covenant*, it *procures a Covenant*, though how it *procures a Covenant* he has not yet informed us; Justification, Reconciliation, Redemption are not the proper and immediate effects of his death; nor indeed is any thing so, but the abolishing ceremonies and conforming such a Covenant, as he has obtruded upon us, and for confirming that which he calls the Covenant, there was the least need, and I think no need at all; but he closes up the whole with a parcel of good words; *Christ (says he) procures the pardon of our sins by his death, and dispenses this pardon to us by his Intercession*: Is not this very Canonical, and Orthodox? yes sure; but now mark his interpretation of himself: *He sealed the Covenant of Grace by his blood, and intercedes for us in the virtue of his blood*. So that he wheels about again, and Procuration is turned into Confirmation: *Christs procuring the pardon of sin is no more than that he has sealed this Doctrine, that whosoever believes and obeys shall be pardoned*; Expiation that's owing to Christs intercession in heaven, and reconciliation is nothing but making the Jews and Gentiles friends, and preaching the Gospel to reclaim men from their debaucheries.

Notwithstanding all this our Author will not be beaten out of it, but that he and his principles are better friends to the blood of Christ, than those men that pretend to magnific it: for they attribute no more to it than the non-imputation of sin; that Christ by his death, bearing and undergoing the punishment that was due to us, paying the ransom that was due for

us, delivered us from this condition (the wrath, and curse of God and his whole displeasure, &c.) But now our Author ascribes much more than all this comes to; For (says he) the Scripture gives us a different account of it, we are said to be justified, and redeemed by the blood of Christ, nay we have boldness to enter into the Holiest by the Blood of Jesus; we have admission into Heaven it self, but the Doctor (Owen) says, that the Blood of Christ makes us innocent, but cannot give us a right to the Kingdom of Heaven. And now what comparison is there between these two? The summe of the business is this: Our Author attributes perhaps more to the Blood of Christ in wordy complement, but what the Doctor ascribes to the Death of Christ, he does in reality: Our Author will confess, that we are redeemed by the Blood of Christ; but when you come, (as all that are not Children will come) to examine what he means by it, then it shrinks into this: Christ by his Death confirmed the Promise of Pardon and Life to them that Believe and Obey, and this Promise he has appointed to be declared to the world, and when men believe it, and obey the Gospel themselves, they are then Redeemed; Christs death is no immediate, no proper Cause of Redemption, no price pay'd to God, accepted by him for poor Captive Sinners: Nay our Author will not stick to say, We are justified by the Blood of Christ too, but when you come to sift his Notion, it's all bran; he confirmed the Promise, which when we believe, and obey the Gospel Commands, we are justified; so that in my weak Judgement, it had been commendable in our Author, to have been very sure that he attributes any thing at all to the Death of Christ, as the proper Cause

*Cause of that Mercy, before he enter'd into Degrees of Comparison with others; something I do perceive indeed he would attribute to Christs Death, viz. The confirming of a certain Covenant, but so feebly asserted, so weakly proved, that it needs the Candour of the Reader: But now what doe these other men attribute to the blood of Christ? Why Nothing but Non-Imputation of Sin, bearing and undergoing the Punishment that was due to us, paying the Price that was due for us; delivering us from this Condition, (The Wrath, Curse, and whole displeasure of God,) and that by the Death of Christ, all Cause of Quarrel and Rejection is taken away: And if this be Nothing in our Authors Arithmetick, we desire he will ascribe more to it, if he can justify it when he has done: But the truth is, our Author is most grievously gulled in this business; He reads their Writings who are too crafty for him, and smile to see how little he understands of them; Though these men attribute no more to the blood of Christ as shed on the Cross, yet they are willing to let him know, that they attribute more to the Blood of Christ than as it was shed on the Cross: The Blood of Christ, and the Death of Christ, are not Expressions of equal latitude: All the Concerns of Christs Blood are not comprehended in his Death; for they consider it as that in the virtue whereof he intercedes for them upon the Throne of Grace; as that which gives them a holy and humble boldness to draw nigh to God, the Quarrel being removed by his Death: And that our Author may see his own delusion herein, I shall give him a short Collation from that person whom he contends with: *Exercit. on Heb. Vol. 2. p. 99.* "There are Two general Ends of Christs*

T t 3

"Inter-

"Interposition: 1. *Avertuncatio Mali*, the turning
 "ing away of all Evil, hurt, damage, or punishment,
 "ment, on the Account of our sins, and Apostacy
 "from God: 2. *Acquisitio Boni*; or, the procuring
 "and obtaining for us, every thing that is good,
 "with respect to our Reconciliation to him, Peace
 "with him, and Enjoyment of him; and these are
 "intended in the general parts of his Office. For,
 "1. His Oblation principally respects the making
 "Atonement for sins, and the turning away Gods
 "wrath, which is due to Sinners, wherein he was
 "Jesus the Deliverer, who saves us from wrath to
 "come. And this is all that is included in the Nature
 "of Oblation, as absolutely considered; but it
 "had a farther Prospect, for with respect to that
 "Obedience which he yielded to God therein, according
 "to the Terms of that Covenant, betwixt
 "the Father and Christ, it was not onely Satisfactory,
 "but Meritorious; that is, by the Sacrifice of
 "himself, he not onely turned away the wrath of
 "God that was due to us, but also obtained for us
 "Eternal Redemption, with all the Grace and Glory
 "thereto belonging. And now if our Author will
 "but ascribe any of all these things to the blood of
 "Christ, as its proper and immediate Cause; he may
 "hope to perswade the world, that he is willing to
 "ascribe something to the Blood of Christ. I know
 "well he will say, That the Blood of Christ is said to
 "Redeem us, is said to Justifie us; these are Scripture
 "Phrases indeed, the sound of words carries it
 "thus; but when he comes to open the Meaning of
 "things, the Blood of Christ does neither redeem,
 "nor justifie us, but after multitudes of Deductions,
 "and great windings of Inferences, and Conclusions,

one

one upon the Neck of another ; it does *that*, which does *another thing*, which procures a *third*, which leads to a *fourth*, which brings us to *believe*, that *Belief* may possibly bring us to *Obedience*, and when all is done, it's *our Obedience* that *justifies us*. And we owe our *Acceptation with God*, to our own *Obedience*, and he is more inclined to think, that nothing can *justify us*, rather than to own it due to the *Righteousness of Christ* imputed, as he expresses himself, p. 272. And now at length he once more casts up his Reckonings: *Our Righteousness, and Acceptance with God, is wholly owing to the Covenant which he has purchased, and sealed with his own blood.* What a rare sound does that word *purchase* carry with it? But, 1. He has purchased no more, than that we shall be Pardon'd and Saved, if we Believe and Obey, without any *Ability* purchased to Believe and Obey. 2. Christ did not *purchase* any one single, *Spiritual Benefit* for us, as the Cause of it, *immediate and proper*. 3. He purchased Nothing but that he may lose the whole *Benefit* of his Purchase. 4. *Obedience* will as soon save us without the *Blood of Christ* as with it: *Lesser Obedience* with that *Blood*, is not more acceptable to God than *Greater* without it: But this he will call an *Influence* upon our *Acceptation with God*. I confess, he is a Free-man, for ought I know, and may call, or mis-call *Things*, as he has done *Persons* at his pleasure, but surely no man whose understanding is his own, would ever call this an *Influence* upon our *Acceptation with God*; A *contingent, uncertain Influence* it may have upon our *Obedience*, but none at all upon the *Acceptation of our Obedience*. An act of Love to God, is as welcome and acceptable to God at this

rate, without Christ as with Him: But this is the Milery of it; when Men must say *something*, and yet cannot tell well what to say, but either *on the one hand* they must flie in the Face of the Scripture, which they *hardly dare do*; or else *on the other hand* renounce their beloved Errors, which they are resolved *never to do*; then must the Scriptures be wrested to *their crooked Sentiments*, instead of Rectifying their *crooked Notions* by the straight Rule of the written Word.

[2] Having now Informed us *what Influence the Death of Christ has upon our acceptance with God*, it remains that he Instruct us *with equal Ingenuity*, what *Influence the Righteousness of his Life has upon God, for the same end*? But here he will be to seek, for having assigned in words so much to the *Death of Christ*, there is nothing left for *his Life*. No matter upon which it may work; but seeing all the former *was in pretence*, there is Employment enough for it left still.

Though the pardon of sin, and our justification, be attributed (says he) to the blood of Christ, yet I could never persuade my self that this wholly excludes the perfect obedience, and righteousness of his life: He cannot persuade himself; very strange! what had he attempted to satisfy his judgement about the exclusion of Christs righteousness, and yet could he not be persuaded? yes, persuaded he was to exclude it, but not wholly to exclude it, there were some rubs, and little scruples in the way, that he could not get over: but had he improved his own principles, and built upon his own foundation, I could have shewn him a way how he might wholly have excluded it, for p. 243. he gives it us as a Note worth our observing
that

that in the whole New Testament there is no such expression as the Righteousness of Christ; And p. 78. he lays it down as an infallible maxime; That we cannot draw any one conclusion from the person of Christ, which his Gospel hath not expressly taught; seeing then we cannot safely draw any such conclusion from Christs Person, and the Scripture has not expressly taught it, what should hinder him from a pleophory in this point, wholly to exclude that from his Creed, which is not expressly taught in the Scripture, and therefore may not be drawn from the consideration of his Person by consequence. And if his scruples had been but as strong against the righteousness of Christ, (or he had been in the scrupling mood) as against the justification of Abraham by the righteousness of Christ, this matter had been put out of doubt with him wholly long before this. In the mean time, The righteousness of Christ is mightily beholden to his good Nature, that when by his principles he might, yet out of civility he would not, and therefore could not wholly exclude it: Some Place, some Room it shall have, some Remote and Improper causality, as the Death of Christ had in our Acceptation with God: But what may be the Reason why he could not altogether, as well as almost exclude it? O, he tells us, that the Apostle tells him, Ephes. 1. 6. That we are accepted in the Beloved. And is this the great difficulty? Alas, one of his Wedges would make this little Knot flie at the first stroke: May there not possibly be given another meaning of it? Must it needs be Interpreted of Acceptation through the active Obedience of Christ? This would have donethe work. Or thus, Our acceptance is ascribed to the Obedience of Christs Life, because that has

(100)
has a great Influence upon us to make us Obedient, which is that Righteousness for which we are accepted of God. The Example of Christ has given us a Pattern of Obedience, which when we Imitate, we are accepted of God; but what now if he had played one of his Omnipotent Machines against the Text, he might have Batter'd down the Conclusion with ease. By the Beloved, is meant Christ, by Christ, is meant the Gospel; by the Gospel is meant Obedience, and then the sense is no more but this; We are accepted in the Beloved, that is, We are accepted for our selves. And I must needs say, this had been a far more Rational Course, than that he has taken with the Death of Christ: Ay, but (says he) whatever rendered Christ beloved of God, did contribute something to our Obedience: Something? That's a huge Kindness indeed; There's a vast distance between something and nothing, and yet it may be such a something, as is next to nothing. Well, we are glad of a little till we can get more: For because he was beloved of God, we are accepted for his sake: That's high, and surprizing. But still, What kind of Cause was Christ's Obedience of our acceptance? One of the Poorest, Lowest causes in the World, is one that they Nick-name a *Causa sine quâ non*; which yet is properly no cause at all; And yet our Author when time was, could tell us, pag. 43. That had Christ never appeared in the World, yet we have reason to believe God is thus Wise, Good, and Merciful, to forgive us our sins, when we return to our Duty: Such a Cause was the Death of Christ of our acceptance. Pag. 46. Gods requiring such a Sacrifice as the Death of Christ for the Expiation of our sins, was not because he could
not

not do otherwise. If now we might have been accepted without his *Incarnation*, I presume we might have been so without his *Obedience*; and then it is not so much as that little nothing of a *Causa sine qua non*: But this is pure Trifling; For the Question was, *What Influence Christs Righteousness had upon our acceptance with God?* He answers, *That because Christ was beloved, we are beloved for his sake.* That is, Christs Obedience has an Influence upon our acceptance; but what that Influence is, remains a Secret: Suppose the Question had been, *Why are we accepted for Christs sake?* The answer might have been, *His Obedience has an Influence upon our acceptation.* Those two words, [Influence, and Sake,] are like two Rackets, that Toss the Ball from one to another, to the end of the Game: However, *Rebus sic stantibus*, under our present Circumstances; I would gladly know, *What that Influence is?* Why, He thinks no man will deny that God was very highly pleased with the perfect Obedience of our Saviours Life. Truly, I think so too, and perhaps it may be the last time that we shall be both of a mind: But yet to put it upon thinking, is a more cunning way of Tempting our unbelief to appear against it. Had it been a truth wherein our Authors affections had been bespoken, I doubt not but we should have had better Proof than his thinking, or standing to the Courtesie of mens denial: But still, still the Difficulty presses us: Why God should be ever the more pleased with our Obedience, because He was pleased with Christs? For if no consideration be had of Christs Obedience in the Justification of a sinner, as that which God accepts for our Non-obedience, I do not
see,

see, but God had been as *well pleased* with our Obedience *without Christ's* Obedience, as *with it* : The Obedience of Christ was a Transient thing, it's past and gone long since, and how it should *come in remembrance* before God, at this day, that for *the sake of it*, we should find favour in his Eyes ; is (without the Doctrine of Imputation) very unaccountable. Why, that is the thing wherein our Author will at length Resolve us.

"We know (*says he*) how many Blessings God bestowed upon the Children of *Israel*, for the sake of their Fathers, *Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob*, who were great Examples of Faith and Obedience, which made them very dear to God ; and there is no doubt but God was more pleased with the Obedience of Christ, than with the faith of *Abraham*, and therefore we ought not to think that we receive no Benefit by the Righteousness of Christ, when *Abraham's* Posterity was so blessed for his sake. I have several humble Propositions to make upon this Discourse. 1. *We ought not to think that we have no benefit* : But how shall we do to know what *that Benefit* is ? Great or Small, Spiritual, or Temporal ? Must we content our selves with thinking ? Surely, we have *some benefit*, if we could but tell *what it was* : It may be, we *may want that benefit* ; and may have it for asking, for *his sake*, and yet still we must *not know what it is* ; or it may be *some small benefit* that cannot be seen without a *Microscope* ; such it *may be*, and yet answer all the necessary Import of his words. 2. *We ought not to think that we have no benefit* : But have we the benefit of *acceptation with God* ? For that was the Question, if I have not forgotten,

as well as our Author: So that though we should be so charitably credulous as to take it upon one of our Authors Say-soes, and Thinkings, that we have some benefit by it, yet if it be not the very benefit under Dispute, it's monstrously Impertinent. 3. We ought not to think: But what if we do think so? With what argument will he compel us to alter our judgments? For I see this is his Device, when he has no mind to a Truth, to lay the Proof of it upon thinking, and a well fortified fancy. 4. Let us now examine his Similitude: God (says he) bestowed many Blessings upon Israel, for the sake of their Fathers. But, 1. VVere they accepted of God, Pardoned, Justified, for their Fathers sake? If not, How will it follow, that we are Accepted, Pardoned, Justified, for the sake of Christs Obedience, because they received some common Favours for the sake of Abraham? 2. VVould God give them any blessings for their Fathers sake, unless they walked in their steps? If not, then they were not accepted for their Fathers obedience sake, but for their own: For why should they need the sake of their Fathers Obedience, to procure them Blessings for their Obedience, more than their Fathers needed the sake of another to procure them Blessings for their Obedience? But if so, that God did give them many blessings for their Fathers sakes, though they walked not in the steps of their Faith, and Exemplary Obedience: That is indeed to the purpose, but then it will be in danger of proving that God may give us Gospel blessings for Christs sake, though we walk not in his steps. Indeed we read, that when Israel was most unworthy, and had provoked God most, that God did remember his Covenant made with

with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and God may have special Favours too for sinners, who personally considered are unworthy of the least Mercy, which some will call the Imputation of Christs Obedience.

3. The true account of those Favours which God bestowed upon Israel for Abrahams sake, is this: God had made a Promise to Abraham, that in his Seed all the Nations of the Earth should be blessed. That is, That in the Messiah which should come of this Line by Isaac, there should be a Blessedness, or Happiness, provided for the miserable undone World: This Promise was afterwards clear'd up to Judah, that the Messiah should be conveyed to the World by his Tribe; this being an absolute, irrevocable Promise; that God would out of that People, that Tribe, deliver a Saviour to the World: It was necessary that God should preserve that Tribe, that People, out of which the Messiah was to come; and as it was necessary for the truth of the Promise, that that Tribe should be conserved in being, so was it necessary for the evidencing of the fulfilling of the Promise, that that Tribe should be continued in some considerable state of Visibility in the World; that so the Promise might not only be made good in itself, but that it might be made out that it was made good, to the Conviction of Gain-sayers. This was the Reason why, when Judah had sinned, and God Corrected them, yet still He remembered this Covenant; he left his People a Lamp for Davids sake, on this account that People escaped utter Extirpation, when they were upon the borders of Desolation: To this Zachary imputes the giving of the Messiah, Luke 1. 72. To perform the Mercy promised to our Fathers, and to remember His holy Covenant.

venant. The Oath which he Swore to our Father Abraham. 4. Perhaps this may be some account of it: The Covenant which God made with Abraham, he made with his Seed also, Gen. 17. 7. *I will be thy God, and the God of thy Seed.* Abraham therefore, and his Seed, were but one of the Parties to that Gracious Covenant; and therefore God in his Providential Dispensations dealing with them as one Body, the Obedience, Holiness of Abraham the Head, was considered as the Obedience, and Holiness of the Body, so far at least as to turn away temporal Evils, and procure temporal Mercies: And if this be so, we may consider Christ and Believers as one Mystical Body, and God in Covenant with Christ their Head, and in him with them, and then our Authors Argument will hold, though his Cause break: If God for the sake of Abrahams imperfect Obedience, yet as he was the Head of the League, gave so many temporal Mercies to Israel; surely then, God for the sake of Christ, the Head of all that the Father hath given him, will bestow Spiritual and Eternal Mercies; for, the Head and Members making but one Body, the Obedience of the Head, is reputed the Obedience of the Members: And as the Blessings which God bestows for Christs sake, are Transcendently greater, than those bestowed on Israel for Abrahams sake; so is the Obedience which Christ performed upon it's own account, and the Dignity of the Person, infinitely beyond the imperfect Obedience of Abraham; and the Union which Faith makes with Christ is a stricter Union, than any Natural, Civil, Political Union, that could possibly be, between Abraham and his Posterity. Thus I have endeavoured to vindicate

ONT

our Authors Argument; but I am sure he had rather it should *perish*, than be thus *justified*.

But is it not strange, our Author should tell us, That he knows how many Blessings God bestowed upon the Children of Israel for their Fathers sakes, and yet not acquaint us with one single Blessing that God bestows on us for Christs sake? For the sake of Christs Personal Obedience? I wish I had so much Interest in any Friend of his, that had that Interest in him to persuade him to acquaint us freely, and open-heartedly, what those blessings are, and how procured? Why, just now he comes to it: *The Righteousness of his Life, and the Sacrifice of his Death, both serve to the same end to establish, and confirm the Gospel-Covenant: God was so well pleased with what Christ did and suffered, with the obedience of his Life, and Death, that for his sake he entered into a Covenant of Grace with Mankind.* Very good, what needed all this Circumlocution, and Periphrase? To beat about, and about the Bush? Had it not been more Civil to have given us our doom in plain English, than to Tantalize us with sugared hopes, and expectations of some great matter from Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob? Some would say. 1. That this ascribes more Influence to Abrahams Obedience than thus to Christs; for God for the sake of Abrahams Active Obedience entered into a Covenant with Israel, and chose them to be his peculiar People, without the Death of Abraham: but the Obedience of Christs Life, and Death, must both concur to procure this Covenant; and yet it is such a one, as I suppose God would not refuse upon as small an account as the sake of Abraham. 2. Some will say, this is not to Answer the Question, but perplex it: The Que-

Question at first was, *what influence the Righteousness of Christs Life, and the Sacrifice of his Death have upon our acceptation with God?* He Answers, *They serve to establish the Covenant; they confirm to us, that God will pardon, and save us if we believe and Obey: but what if I Obey without such confirmation, shall my Obedience be rejected without it be performed upon that Confirmation?* Ay, but *God entered into this Covenant of Grace for Christs sake:* Still I say that's not an answer, but the bandying the Question upon us again a hundred times over: *Why should his Life and Death have such an influence upon God to make that Covenant? Why should they Operate that way? What connexion is there between Christs active and passive Obedience, and such a Covenant?* But sure we forget our selves, for we are enquiring into the influence of Christs Active Obedience: And

(1.) For *Confirming a Covenant*; let any rational Man satisfy me how "The Obedience of a Person perfectly holy, pure, spotless, sinless, being accepted of God should prove this promise, That therefore God will accept them whose best Obedience is imperfect, and defective. This is so far from confirming it, that God will accept me, who am a Sinner, that it leads to utter despair of acceptance with him; seeing I came so infinitely short of my pattern: What hope can a sinner have of acceptance, from a consideration, that God has accepted Christ, who was no sinner: If Faith was ready to believe that God would accept him that believes and obeys; yet had it seen Christs Faith and Obedience, and his acceptance thereon, it might have stagger'd him that ever such pitiful things as his Faith and Obedience

U U

dience

dience should find favour with God. And if Faith was so strong, as to overcome *that difficulty*, as to believe the Promise notwithstanding *this staggering Example*; yet it's far enough from Truth, that a sinner should believe the promise *ever the more*, that his imperfect Service should be accepted and rewarded, because Christs entire obedience was so. Nay, without question it had been a greater confirmation of that promise, to have had assurance that God had pardoned some *hainous Offender*, some *flagitious wretch*, who deserved Condemnation, than to behold him accepting a Person *not obnoxious to Condemnation*: So says the Apostle, *1 Tim. 1. 16.* *Howbeit for this cause I obtained mercy, that in me first Jesus Christ might shew forth all long-suffering, for a pattern to them who hereafter should believe on him to Life everlasting.* The Pardon of a *Blasphemer*, one *injurious*, a *Persecutor*, is a stronger confirmation that God will pardon a sinner, than the acceptance of Him that had done no wrong, neither was *guile found in his mouth.*

(2.) But now for Gods making such a promise for Christs sake, or entering into a Covenant to pardon, accept for Christs sake; this answers not the Question in the least: for, 1. It onely asserts, *that God has declared openly, that he will do it.* Now, a Declaration of Pardon, is not a Pardon; a promise of acceptance, is not acceptance; and therefore a Reason of, or Motive to such a Promise, such a Declaration, is not a Reason of, or Motive to Pardon and acceptance: Christs Obedience was so well pleasing to God, that for his sake, he made such a Promise. Well; but if my Obedience be little, Christs Obedience will not make it accepted, as if it were great;

great; if imperfect it will not render it accepted, as if it were perfect. 2: That God has made such a promise for Christs sake, answers not the Question; for it's but turning the Question into an Assertion: As if we should enquire, what Reason is there that God should accept me for Christs obedience? And he should Answer, there is a Reason, why God should accept me for it, but never shew the Reason: Or thus, What Cause is Christs Obedience, of the Acceptance of our Obedience? And he should say, it is a Cause, but not shew the Cause.

But then further, "The Obedience and Righteousness of Christs Life was one thing which made his Sacrifice so Meritorious. I confess, I question the Truth of the Proposition; had Christ Sacrificed himself as soon as he came into the World, his Sacrifice had been as Meritorious, being the Sacrifice of him that as Priest was God and Man; and as Sacrifice, was the Sacrifice of him that was Personally United with God; but I am not concerned to insist upon that at present: All I say, is, that it's no Answer to the Question; for to the best of my remembrance, (and it's not a full Twelve-moneth since the Question came before us) the Question was, "What influence the Righteousness of Christs Life hath upon our Acceptance? and now we have got an Answer to another Question: "What influence the Righteousness of Christs Life has upon his own Acceptance with God? As if we were at the Old Childish Game of cross Questions: It was asked me, How many Miles it is to London? and it was answered me, Thirteen shillings and a groat make a Noble. For what is this Meritoriousness of Christs Obedience? did he Merit for himself, or for us? If

for himself only, then it's out of the Olives; If for us, then that which he has Merited is ours. Merit denotes a proportion between the Work done, and the Reward received; and it's strict Justice in God to bestow upon us, that which another has Merited for us: if then Christ has Merited our Acceptance, we cannot but be accepted; it's Justice we should be so. Again, what is it, that Christ has Merited? Is it acceptance? Our Author will not say it; what then? Why, a promise of acceptance; that is, that we shall be pardoned and saved upon Faith and Obedience: And this is the bottom of the bag; when he has turned his discourse into a thousand shapes and forms, and varied his expressions infinitely, yet all amounts to no more than this, Christ has confirmed a promise, procured a promise, merited a promise, that if we believe and obey, we shall be pardoned, and saved; and yet the answer to the Question is to come: For,

1. There must be a better Reason assigned than the Righteousness of Christs Life, why the Sacrifice of his Death should merit any thing; for if his active obedience was due to Gods Law upon his own Personal account, it could merit nothing for another: The payment of a Debt, will not merit a reward; and if the Righteousness of Christs Life did not merit any thing it self, it can never make his Death meritorious.
2. To Merit for us a reward, upon a condition, and never to merit for us that condition, is next to nothing, as the Case stands with us: For both Christ and we shall lose that which he has Merited, if our Obedience be left to the desultoriness of our own will, and the imbecillity of corrupt Nature: Upon the whole Matter I conclude, that according to his Principles our Author cannot shew any one thing in all the

Life

Life and Death of Christ, that may render our Persons and Services more acceptable to God, than they would otherwise have been, upon equal Holiness and Obedience; and therefore we must make our Application to Persons of other apprehensions in Religion, if we would have an honest satisfactory Answer to this Question: "What influence the Righteousness of Christs Life, and the Sacrifice of his Death, have upon our Acceptance with God.

There is a Text, which some think will shew us more of that "True influence that the Righteousness of Christ hath upon our Acceptance with God, than all this tedious rambling Discourse of our Authors; It is *Rom. 5. 18, 19. Therefore as by the offence of one, judgment came upon all Men to Condemnation, even so, by the Righteousness of one, the free gift came upon all Men to Justification of Life: For as by one mans disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made Righteous: From whence I have heard some Argue; In the same sense that all are made sinners in the first Adam, all that are righteous are made righteous in the second Adam; but in the first Adam, all are made sinners by the imputation of his Disobedience, therefore all that are righteous, are made so, in the second Adam, by the imputation of his Obedience. Again, If it was the Active Disobedience of the first Adam, whereby many (even all that were in him,) were made sinners; then it is the active obedience of the second Adam, whereby Many (even all that are in him,) are made righteous; but the former is true, therefore so is the latter. But (says our Author) This is the most that can be made of that place: This? What? Why this something,*

or *this nothing*, which he had said before; "That
 "God was so well pleased with the Obedience of
 "Christ's Life, that for his sake he entred into a
 "Covenant of Grace with Mankind: And if this be
 all that can be made of that Text, the Opposition
 must run thus; *As God was so ill-pleased with the
 Disobedience of Adams Life, that for the sake of it*
 he entred into a Covenant of Works with Mankind;
 So he was so well pleased with the Obedience of
 Christ's Life, that for the sake of it, he entred into
 a Covenant of Grace with Mankind. Really it
 must be so, Reader; take it, or leave it; for look
 what influence Adams Disobedience had upon God
 to provoke him to condemn the World, the same
 influence had Christ's obedience upon God to please
 him to save the World. And will not this be a
 rare contrivance, to fancy a Covenant of Works,
 instituted after the Fall of Adam, when we are certain
 it was established before his Disobedience? And so
 was the Covenant of Grace before the *Active*, and
Actual obedience of Christ: However let us con-
 sider the most he can make of it. First (says he)
 there's no necessity of expounding this *Veraxion* of the
 Righteousness of Christ's Life, or his *active* obedience.
 This Answer of our Authors is like the *Ariere banne*,
 it's never raised but in a case of extreme urgency:
 an Answer that will serve the turn of all the *Atheists*,
Hereticks, and *Miscreants* upon Earth: If you tell
 them that *Eternal Salvation* is promised in the Gos-
 pel, they have it at their fingers ends, that there is
 no necessity that *Eternal* should signifie a duration
 beyond the Horizon of time: it's used in other places
 for the lengthning out the existence of a thing to it's
 own allotted period. Thus the *Aaronical Priesthood*

was

was an everlasting Priesthood; it was to continue for the Ever of the Jewish World. And as for that word *Salvation*, there's no necessity it should signify a deliverance from Spiritual Evils; for besides that, there were no promises of any such Salvation in the old Testament; the word is often used in the New, for temporal deliverance: As when the Apostle said, *Except these abide in the Ship ye cannot be saved*, Acts 27. But why is there no necessity of it? It may well signify no more than his Death, because the Apostle tells us, Phil. 2. 8. *That Christ became obedient unto Death, ὑπήκοος*; but by his leave, the word ὑπήκοος does indeed signify obedient in general, and ὑπακοὴ obedience in it's common Nature, without determining it's signification either to active or passive obedience; but do they argue from the Nature and purport of the Word, that because Christ's obedience is called ὑπακοὴ, therefore it must needs be active obedience? No such matter; but they argue from another hard word, Ycleped Antithesis, from the opposition that is there made between Adams disobedience, and Christ's obedience. Thus the Dr. argued, if our Author durst have read him; Com. p. 185. "It's opposed to the disobedience of Adam, which was Active; The *ὑπακοὴ* is opposed to *ἁπαλωμα*, The Righteousness to the Fault: The Fault was an active transgression of the Law, and the obedience opposed to it, must be an active accomplishment of it: If the *ἁπαλωμα* of Adam was active, then the ὑπακοὴ of Christ must be active. But our Author will have the other bout with him. Christ's offering himself in Sacrifice is called doing the will of God, Heb. 10. 9, 10. "And whether this be properly said or not, I will leave the Dr. to

U u 4

"dis-

"dispute it with the Apostle: But I do not perceive the Doctor has *any contraversion with*, though he has maintained many *for the Apostle*: They are very well agreed, for ought I perceive, nor shall they Quarrel if I can help it: The Doctor will not contend, *that Christs assuming a body in order to the offering a Sacrifice to God, was not doing his will*; no, he pleads for it, to the cost of somebody: But this is that which he disputes, that in *Rom. 5. 18, 19. The Opposition between Adams Disobedience, and Christs Obedience*, will prove them *both of the same kind*; It's acknowledged that Christ did *actively obey* in suffering; his sufferings were *Activo passiva*: But yet the *Obedience* mentioned in the place before us, was an *Active Obedience*, because *Adams Disobedience* was so. One blow more, and then our Author will yield us the Cause: "There is no expresse mention "*(says he)* made in this Chapter of any other Act "*of Obedience whereby we are reconciled to God,* "*but onely his dying for us, which makes it more* "*than probable, that by his Righteousness and O-* "*bedience, the Apostle understands his Death and* "*Sufferings. I assure you, I like it well when Men* argue *from the Context*, provided they do not *de-* *stroy the Text*; and had our Author Religiously ob- served this Rule, he had not turned his Readers sto- macks so often with nauseous Interpretations, but yet I have a few things to offer to him: 1. That though there be *no other act of Obedience* mentioned whereby we are *reconciled*, yet there may be another *act of Obedience* mentioned whereby we may be *completely justified*. 2. Though there be *no other act of Obedience* mentioned in the *fore-going verses*, yet there may be *one in this*. No Laws of
 Coherence

Coharence or Contexture, ever obliged an Author that he might *not pass to new matter*; and so has the Apostle done in this place, and Case, *as the Opposition most undeniably proves*. 3. All that he says, makes it *but more than probable*: Now, had there been *any colour* for Truth of his Conceit, his confidence does not use to dwindle away into *probabilities*, but he had fetcht the *Great Commander*, and knock'd us all dead with *irrefragable Demonstration*; for do you understand the Myſtery of this [more than probable] when you hear him confess, that Matters *seem to be against him*, and but *probably*, or *a little more than probably* for him: You need not lay your Ear to listen in what quarter the wind fits. But then 4. ——— Nay, hold; Our Author yields: Good Nature begins to work; "But yet (*says he*) these Expressions, his Righteousness, and Obedience, seem to take in the whole compass of his Obedience in doing and Suffering the will of God. All is well then, and Dr. Owen is a very honest Man again. And we will not vex our selves how to reconcile, *more than probable* Con: with *seeming* Pro. I have made some attempts formerly, and once more whilst our Author is in the tractable vein, I le try whether the Doctor and he may not be made good Friends; for since our Author is coming towards a willingness to *take in Active Obedience*, it's but attempting however to prevail with the Doctor *not to exclude the Passive*. Well, look once more: *Com. p. 185. That the Passive Obedience of Christ is here Onely intended, is false*; so that all that the Doctor contends for, is, that the *Passive Obedience* is not *solely* intended to the *exclusion of the Active*.

— We

We are all agreed then in the meaning of *the simple Terms*, and it's well if we do not fall out again about the *Propositions* that result from them: Let us now hear his Comment upon the words. "The meaning of the words (*says he*) is this: That "as God was so highly displeased with *Adams sin*, "that he entail'd a great many evils, and miseries, "and death it self, upon his Posterity, for his sake: "So God was so well pleased with the Righteousness "and Obedience of Christs Life and Death, that he "bestows the Rewards of Righteousness on those "who according to the strictness and rigour of the "Law are not Righteous; that for Christs sake he "hath made a New Covenant of Grace, which "pardons our past sins and follies, and rewards a "sincere, though imperfect Obedience.

There are two Questions which he here undertakes to Answer. First, *What Influence Adams sin hath upon his Posterity?* and Secondly, it is to be hoped that from thence we may at last know, *What Influence Christs Righteousness and Obedience have upon our acceptance with God?*

I. *Quest. What Influence hath Adams sin upon his Posterity?* To this he returns. "God was so "highly displeased with *Adams sin*, that he entail'd "a great many evils, and miseries, and death it "self, upon his Posterity, for his sake: Now, all this is true, very true; but whether it be the whole Truth, that which will satisfy the design of the Text I shall examine by and by. At present I shall onely make some short Notes upon it.

1. "God (*says he*) was so highly displeased "with *Adams sin*, that for his sake he entail'd a great "many evils. Now, had it not been fair to have shewn

shown the Justice, as well as the Highness of Gods Displeasure in such a proceeding with his Posterity? That God was justly, as well as highly displeased with Adams Sin, never created a Doubt to any man; but that he should be so highly displeased with the Sin of one single Man, to entail Evils upon Millions, upon all his Posterity, this would invite us to examine the Righteousness of the Entail. The Posterity of Adam knew nothing of Adams Sin, were not conscious nor consenting to it, and yet God involves them in the Consequences of Adams Sin.

2. *God (says he) entail'd those Evils upon his Posterity for Adams sake. Now here's the old Blind again: For to say, that God did it for Adams sake, implies, that Adams sin had an influence, and it had this influence, but how it could righteously or indeed possibly have that influence, is still a Question; and till that be resolved, we shall never have the advantage from hence to know, how the Righteousness of Christ could have an Influence upon God, to shew us any kindness for Christs sake.*

3. *God (says he) entail'd a great many Evils and miseries upon his Posterity, for his sake. Now seeing there are but a Many (though a great many) evils entailed upon them, and not all Evils, it's very much our Interest to understand which are the Entailed evils, and which our own Personal evils; which are hereditary, and which of our own procurement; that so having found out which are entailed upon us, we may search if there be not a way found to cut off the Entail, by the Recovery wrought out by Christ. And the rather, because the Text mentions not only Evils, many Evils, but seems to include*

clude all Evils; As Life and Absolution, comprehend all spiritual Mercies; so Death and Condemnation comprehend all spiritual Curses: And by these comprehensive words, the Apostle expresses those Evils which God upon the Account of Adam's Sin, has entailed upon Posterity. I know how easily our Author presumes to dock the Entail, by pleading, that Death signifies onely Temporal Death; but the Apostle has obviated that Cavil, v. 11. *As by one Man Sin entered into the world, and Death by Sin, and so Death passed upon all Men, for that all have sinned. By one man, by Adam, that Sin whose wages is Death, and that Death which is the wages of Sin, enter'd into the world, even upon all his Posterity, for that all have sinned. And what that Death is, which is the Wages of Sin, he assures, by opposing it to Eternal Life, v. 21. As Sin reigned unto Death, so might Grace reign through Righteousness unto Eternal Life, by Jesus Christ our Lord. So again Chap. 6. v. 23. The Wages of Sin is Death, but the Gift of God is Eternal Life.*

2 Qu. What Influence has Christs Righteousness and Obedience upon our Acceptation with God? And had our Author answered the former question to purpose, he had answered this in it, and saved himself a great deal of needless pains in a New prosecution of it. But he answers: "God was so well pleased with the Righteousness of Christs Life and Death, that he bestowes the Rewards of Righteousness on those, who according to the strictness and rigour of the Law are not righteous: That for Christs sake, he hath made a New Covenant of Grace, which pardons our past sins and follies, and rewards a sincere though imperfect

Obedience,

"Obedience. A few notes also I shall make upon this, and so dismiss it at present.

And, First, here is certainly a great Juggle in these words: God (says he) was so well pleased with the Righteousness and Obedience of Christs Life and Death, that he bestows the rewards of Righteousness upon us. Now these rewards of Righteousness (be they what they will or can) are either the proper and immediate effects of the Life and Death of Christ, or not: If they be, then I am sure he was tardy p. 323. The Apostles attribute such things to the Blood of Christ, as are the proper and immediate Effects of the Gospel Covenant: And what that is in his Dialect, I hope we are not to seek at this time of day. But if they be not the proper and immediate Effects of the Life and Death of Christ, then, 1. He has juggled here with his Reader, placing the rewards of Righteousness as bestow'd for Christs sake, before any Consideration of the Covenant. 2. If not, then he has not drawn a fair Parallel between the Influence of Adams Sin, and that of Christs Obedience: For he tells us, that God for Adams sake entailed a great many Evils, Miseries, nay Death it self, upon his Posterity; there are particular evils entailed upon Individuall's for the sake of Another, without any intervention of their own personal Transgressions: Ay, but there our Author will perhaps tell me, That the truth is, he means all this while, (by a secret reserve,) that Adams Posterity, when they commit Adams sin, or any other, they then render themselves obnoxious to those miseries, evils, and death it self: But then this is not to the purpose; for then 'tis not for Adams sake, but for their own: Not for that One Mans Offence, but for every

every mans own Offence, that judgement came upon them to condemnation: Which is not to interpret the Apostle, but dictate to him, and indite his Epistles for him. *Miseries* then, and a great many *miseries*, none knows how many, are entail'd upon *Adams Posterity* for his sake, without any intervention of their own sin: But now here's no *Blessing*, not one single *Blessing*, entail'd upon such *spiritual Posterity of Christ*, that they shall receive any one the least *Favour*, without the *Intervention* of their own *Obedience*: And so things are where they were at first.

Secondly, I must note also, That he says, God bestows the rewards of *Righteousness* on those who according to the strictness and rigour of the Law are not righteous: That is, as he explains himself, they shall be justified or treated like righteous Persons:

Now, 1. If God can treat them like *Righteous Persons*, who are not really so; because he is so well pleased with *Christs Obedience*, why may not God conceive me to have done that which I have not done, as well as to be what I am not? Why not to have obeyed in Christ, to have suffer'd in *Christs sufferings*, as to be a righteous Person in my self, when there is no such matter? And thus our Author has laid a block in our way, at which a well-meaning man, (though against our Authors meaning) may stumble upon the Notion of the *Imputation of Christs Righteousness*: It's altogether unintelligible, how God should punish me for *Adams fault* with Justice, if *Adams fault* were not some wayes or other my own; and fully as unaccountable, How God should deal with me as righteous who am not so, for the sake of *Christs Obedience*, if *Christs Obedience* some way

or other become not mine: I can easier satisfy my Reason how the Righteousness of the second Adam may make me righteous, and accepted of God; than how the unrighteousness of the first should make me a sinner; and yet Faith believes both, though it conclude stronglier for Christ, Rom. 5. 17. For if by one mans Offence Death reigned by one, much more they, &c.

2. God (he says) bestows the rewards of Righteousness on those who in strictness are not righteous, Let some enquire at his house, as they go by, What he means by the Rewards of righteousness: Is it Inherent Righteousness? Then it's Non sence, or worse: God gives them inherent righteousness who have not inherent Righteousness, which in sensu composito is Non-sence, and in sensu diviso not agreeable to our Authors Principles: But if he mean, the rewards of Acceptation as righteous when they are not righteous, and this for Christs sake; then either there will be some immediate proper effect found out for the Obedience of Christs Life and Death, or else all comes to no more than this, That God will Accept us righteous or unrighteous, that is, right or wrong.

3. I would observe also, That he supposes God to have dispensed with the Moral Law: Which is News to me, and I confess I doe not believe it, nor shall I, till I hear it confirmed: Some Errors though speculative are damnable, and such may this prove: For if we like Fools goggled in with the Rhetorical Divinity of this Age, should Trust to Gods Abatements of his Law; and at last it should prove, that God loved Righteousness, and hated Iniquity as such, we were in a most wretched, miserable, and undone Condition, merely by Trusting to Indulgence. Demand

mand therefore good Counter-security of our Author, That God will *deal with me as righteous, though I be not so in the Account of his Law*; unless I be considered, *as found in Christ, not having my own righteousness which is of the Law, but that which is by the Faith of Christ, the righteousness of God by Faith*. The Moral Law is the Image of Gods Mind, his Nature transcribed into his Law; and *one jot nor tittle of this Law shall ever pass away*: How much of this Law God will dispense with, *what part of it, or what degrees of the violation of it, is to me unknown*; and if with *any*, whether he may not possibly dispense *with the whole* by the same Reason, is more than our Authors Principles can inform me; he that may dispense *with one part of it, may with another*, and so of the rest: For where to stop, or put bounds to such a Dispensation as comes from the *Grace of God*, is very impossible to determine, unless we knew the true bounds of Gods Grace. And whereas our Author talks of *the rigour of the Law*, there's nothing of it *rigorous in its own Nature*, and the least particle of it would be *impossible to be observed* according to its exact demands, if it were made *the Law of our Justification*: He that breaks the Law *in one point, is guilty of all*; and the Curse is denounced against him that *confirms not all that is written therein to doe it*.

4. The Difficulty remains to this day, Why God should be so *pleased with the Righteousness and Obedience of Christ*, that he should allow the *Disobedience of Another*. And it will remain for ever a Difficulty, both why God should inflict Evils upon the Posterity of *Adam for his sake*, or deal with them *as righteous*, who in the Account of his Holy Law

Law are *not* righteous, for Christs: till we understand the true Nature of the *Two Covenants*, the one made with *Adam* and all his *Natural* seed; the other with *Christ*, and all his *Spiritual* seed; both which Seeds were to stand or fall, according as their respective Heads and Representatives, should acquit themselves in point of Obedience and Disobedience towards God, and his most holy and righteous Law.

The same liberty that he has taken, I question not but he will give, and I shall be very modest in a few Enquiries.

(1.) May we enquire, Whether what he allows of Influence to *Adams Sin* upon his *Posterity*, will satisfy the Apostles Intendment? The Apostle asserts v. 18. *That by the offence of one, judgement came upon all to Condemnation: v. 19. That by one mans Offence, many were made Sinners.* And there are these things considerable:

1. That *Adams Sin* had this Influence upon *Posterity*, that they were made *Sinners* also, ἁμαρτωλοὶ, Transgressors of a Law; for ἁμαρτάνων, is ἀπευχόμενον ὅτι σκοπεῖ, to deviate from a Rule, to come short of a Mark that is set us to aim at, as *Snidas* observes.

2. That the *Posterity of Adam* were so made *sinners*, that they were liable to condemnation; *Judgement* came upon them to *Condemnation*: This I Observe, because some talk as if they were *Sinners* in jest; but God lets the Sons of men know, that they are obnoxious to *Condemnation* for the *Offence* of that one *Man*.

3. The Apostle shews how they were made *sinners*, and how they were liable to *Condemnation*;

X x

Karr

Karicaduous; they were so by a *Constitution*: God did not *infuse* sin into them, and make them sinners *Inherently*; but they were made so by a *Law-constitution*: And it was needful that the Apostle should clear that Point, because the *Vindication of Gods Justice* called for it: For how could God deal with them as *sinners* in respect of *Condemnation*, who were not *first sinners* in respect of *Guilt*? *Guilt* and *Condemnation* do *Reciprocally* prove each other. To assert them to be *sinners*, proves them *liable to Condemnation*; and to assert them *liable to Condemnation*, presupposes them to be *sinners*; for what is *Condemnation* but the *evil of Punishment* inflicted, for the *evil of sin* committed. Nor can it consist with the *Righteousness* of the *Judge of the whole Earth*, to treat them as *sinners* as to *Punishment*, who were not *first so*, as to *Guilt contracted*: To clear therefore the *Righteousness* of God, that he may be *Just* when he *Condemns*; we must understand, that the *sin of Adam* is one way or other made the *sin of his Posterity*: Several ways there are Contrived to *Salve this Difficulty*; some say (as was noted before) that *Adams sin* being *Imitated* by his *Posterity*, they become *sinners*, and so liable to *Condemnation*. A dull Contrivance, which our Author himself will not allow, who asserts, that *God was so displeased with Adams Disobedience*, that for his sake he *Entailed many Evils upon his Posterity*; but if there be nothing more but the *Infection and Contagion* of his *Example*, then it's not for *Adams Sin, Fault, or Offence*, that they are made *sinners*, but for their own: In *Defiance* of the Apostle, and his way of Reasoning: the very truth is, God made a *Covenant with Adam*, and

in him with all his Natural Posterity: Adam was not only the Natural Parent, but the Moral Head and Representative of all his Seed, and therefore according to this Righteous Law of God, his Offence was theirs; what he forfeited, they forfeited; what he lost, they lost; he sinned, they sinned; he came under the Condemnation, they came under it also. And this does fully satisfy the Apostles Reasoning; By one Mans offence, many were made sinners; by one Mans offence, Judgment came upon all to Condemnation. And God has given us pregnant Instances of his Righteous procedure in Punishing the Members of Political Bodies, for the Offences of their Political Heads, 2 Sam. 24. Thus he Punisht Davids sin in Numbering the People, upon the People, who were Innocent in his Transgression personally; and to say (as some have ventured to say,) That the People had sins of their own, for which God might Righteously punish them; is to say a great Impertinent truth: For whatever sins they had of their own, for which God might justly have dealt thus with them, yet God Declares that this was the Impulsive cause of their Punishment, even the sin of David, with whom the People having a Political Union (as our Author phrases it) they made but one Body in the sight of Vengeance: And when others say, That this was but a temporal Punishment, and therefore it will not hold, that God should punish the Posterity of Adam spiritually for his Transgression, they say they know not what: For God will not be Unrighteous and Unjust, in Punishing the Sons of Men for that sin which is none of their own, in the smallest thing, from a Thread to a Shoe-latchet; and the Rule of Justice

in this Case, is *the Law*; for if the Law was back'd by a Sanction of *Spiritual and Eternal threatenings*, then 'tis Just with the Law-giver to Inflict the Punishment upon all that are under the Law; our Union with Adam was another, a *stricter Union*, than the Israelites had with David; it was *Spiritual*, the other *Civil, External only*: And therefore according to the Law of *Union and Relation*, though the Israelites could only suffer for *Dauids sin temporally*, yet the Posterity of Adam may by Righteous Judgment of God, for *Adams sin* suffer *Eternally*. And now let us briefly see, whether our Author comes up to any thing of the Apostle, or no? "God "(*says he*) was so highly displeased with *Adams sin*, that for his sake he Entailed a great many "Evils, Miseries, nay Death it self, upon his Posterity. Nay, but says the Apostle, they were constituted sinners, Judgment and Condemnation came upon them, though they had not sinned after the Similitude of *Adams transgression*; the same Judgment which in the Sanction of the Law, was threatned against *Adams sin*; and now to Fob and Flam off this with *Evils, Miseries*, and never tell us *what they were*, not how it could be Just with God to Entail the *least Evil* upon them, or touch a Hair of their Heads for the sin of another, with whom they had no privity of Interest; is to Reduce the sin of *Adam* as near to Nothing, as he has Reduced Christs Righteousness.

(2.) May we enquire also, VWhether that *Influence* which he allows to *Christs Obedience*, reach the Mind of the Apostle? The Apostle affirms, that *By the Obedience of one, many were made Righteous*; and that by the *Righteousness of one, the Free-gift*

gift came upon all to Justification of Life, v. 18, 19.
Διχαίω καταβήσονται οἱ πολλοί. Many, or the ma-
ny (of whom he Treats) shall be constituted Right-
eous. For as all that were in the first Adam, all his
Natural Seed, were by vertue of a Legal Constitu-
tion, Ordinance, and Appointment of God, made
sinners in the Transgression of their common Head
and Representative; so all the Spiritual Seed and
Posterity of Christ, (which the Father had promi-
sed to give him as the Reward of his Death and Suf-
ferings) are by vertue of a New, a better Law-
constitution made Righteous, by the Righteousness
of their spiritual Head, and Representative: And
therefore the Apostle, v. 14. tells us expressly, That
Adam was the Figure of Christ: He did exactly
represent the Headship of Christ towards all his
spiritual Posterity, in that Headship which he bore
towards his own Posterity: But the Apostle has said
enough in this Chapter, to stomach the Pride and
Restifness of humane Wisdom; nothing more grating
upon the Spirit of a Gallant, than that he should be
made a sinner by the sin, or owe his Righteousness
to the Righteousness of another. This is the summe
of the Apostles Discourse: As the Posterity of A-
dam were made sinners, constituted such by a Law,
and dealt with as such by God; so are the Posterity
of Christ made Righteous, by such another way of
Justification. But then I assume, The Posterity of
Adam could not be made sinners by the sin of Adam,
otherwise than by the Imputation of Adams sin;
therefore the Posterity of Christ could not be made
Righteous otherwise in the sight of God, than by
the Imputation of Christs Righteousness: The Po-
sterity of Adam cou'd not possibly be made sinners

by *Adams first sin*, any other way than by charging it upon them, according to the Terms of that Law under which he and they stood; nor are the Seed of Christ capable of being made Righteous in *Gods sight*, by the Obedience of Christ, otherwise than by *Imputing it to them*, according to that *New Covenant-constitution*, called the *Law of Faith and Righteousness*, under which Christ and Believers do now stand. But if the word *Imputation* do Disgust our Authors *delicate Ears*, let him call it what he pleases, provided the Apostles Argument be satisfied, and his main Design secured; let us now see how our Author comes up to the Apostle. "God *(says he)* was so well pleased with the Obedience and Righteousness of Christs Life, and Death, that for his sake he bestows the rewards of Righteousness on those, who according to the Rigour of the Law are not Righteous: Wherein our *Author* and our *Aposile* come not near one another by many Leagues. 1. Our Author says, *God bestows the reward of Righteousness on them that are not Righteous*. But our Apostle says, *we are made Righteous by the Obedience of Christ, before we can be accounted Righteous by God*: The Holy God will not account *half Righteousness* for a *whole one*; sinners may mock themselves, but they cannot mock God: That which the Law requires, *must be had*; the Apostle tells us, 'tis to be had in *Christ*: By his Obedience, through the Intervention of the *Law-constitution of Faith and Righteousness*, Believers are *made Righteous*. 2. Whatever is Lurking under the darkness of these Expressions, *The Rewards of Righteousness; the Rigour of the Law*; yet this we may be sure of, that all come to this in the

the Up shot: "That God for Christs sake has made
 "a New Covenant of Grace, which Pardons our
 "past Sins and Follies, and rewards a Sincere,
 "though Imperfect Obedience. I can compare our
 Authors *Copia Verborum*, his Variegated Equipollent
 Phrases and Expressions, to nothing so well as that
 of the Chymists, when they endeavour to *bind*
Hermes, or in plain English, their fixing of Quick-
 silver; they can Model it into *many accidental*
Forms and Shapes, and yet the Cunning versute
 Creature will be *Mercury* again, do what they
 can; unless some will compare it to the Young-
 mans Mistress in the Fable, that Brided it for a day,
 or so, but yet upon the sight of her old Game, put
 off her Personated self, and reassumed her real self
 again. Such Feats of Activity have we shown us,
 ever and anon by our Author, he can turn his words
 into more Shapes than *Proteus*; tell us of this and
 that, but when he comes to himself, *All the Infl-*
uence that Christs Obedience has upon our acceptance
wish God, is, that we owe such a Covenant to it as
 he has described to us, and Contrived for us: Tells
 us, That God for Christs sake has entered into a
 Covenant, made a Covenant; his Righteousness and
 Obedience have procured a Covenant; are the *Me-*
ritorious cause of a Covenant; when the total
 Summe of all is no more than this, That God has pro-
 mised to Pardon and Save us if we Believe, and
 Obey the Gospel, though we Obey not perfectly.
 So that at last, it's our own Obedience that Recommends
 us to God, our own Righteousness for which we are
 Justified: Whereas the Apostle is Peremptory,
 That by the Obedience of Christ we are constituted
 Righteous,

His Conclusion is therefore this: *That the Righteousness of Christ, is not the formal Cause of our Justification; but the Meritorious cause of that Covenant whereby we are declared Righteous, and rewarded as Righteous.* I perceive the *Righteousness of Christs Life, and the Obedience of his Death,* are like to prove something ere long: One while they Confirm and Seal, another while they Procure, and at last they Merit a Covenant: I cannot but Examine particulars, though I have often done it.

1. *The Righteousness of Christ, is not the Formal cause of our Justification.* Indeed, I think it is not: Never any Man in his Wits affirmed it so: Give but us leave to call it the *Material cause, or the Meritorious cause immediately and properly of Justification,* and he shall take *Formal cause,* and deal with it at his pleasure. I think I have a Commission from all the Systematical Divines of Germany, the Voluminous *Tigurines,* and Bulky *Low-Dutch,* with those few that are left in England, to make a Bargain with him, Hard and Fast; That the Righteousness of Christ is not the *Formal cause of our Justification.*

2. Says he, *It is the Meritorious cause of that Covenant whereby we are declared Righteous:* A Meritorious cause sounds very high, if it had an honest Meaning: But what has it Merited? *Justification?* By no means: What then? *Any particular Mercy, or Priviledge, or Blessing?* By no means, for then it would be a proper cause of it; there's an Exact and Severe proportion betwixt the *Reward and the Work,* in all Merit: What is it then the Meritorious cause of? Why of a *Covenant:* But are we made Righteous by the *Covenant?* Not at all; only we are declared Righteous: But

But how does the Righteousness of Christs Life, and the Obedience of his Death, *Merit such a Covenant at Gods Hands?* Nay, That he will not tell us. God was well pleased with them, but why he should be so, is a Secret which must be reserved for the coming of *Elias*.

(3.) The last thing I shall Examine, is his Exceptions against our Interpretation of the Apostle. 1. *Δίκαιοι γαρ αδικούντες, Shall be made Righteous* (says he) *is the same with Δικαιοδύνουντες, Shall be Justified.* Well, I agree to him: But then I say, the former Expression explains *the way of our being Justified*; that it is by Vertue of a Gospel-Law-Constitution, or Appointment of God; who considering all Believers *as one* with their Redeemer, does Constitute them Just, and Righteous, (there's the Formal Cause) in the Righteousness of Christ, (there's the Material Cause of Justification) as all the Posterity of *Adam* are constituted Sinners, and liable to Condemnation by the Constitution of the old Law, as Represented by him their Common Head. 2. He excepts: *That the Apostle tells us, ver. 17. Who they are that are Justified by Christ, and shall Reign with him in Life; not those who are Righteous by the Imputation of Christs Righteousness to them.* But I do not hear the Apostle telling me one such word, whatever he has told our Author privately by way of *Cabala*: I hear him saying plainly, *That as by one Mans offence many were made sinners, so by one Mans Obedience many were made Righteous*: And because I cannot devise how possibly one Man should be made a sinner, dealt with as a sinner, Condemned and Judged as, and for a sinner, by another mans sin, unless he be *some ways or other*
guilty

guilty of sin; and because it is not the making of that one mans sin their own by *Imitation and Example*, that the Apostle speaks of, but by a *constitution of a Covenant or Law*: Therefore till I can find a better Term to expresse the Doctrine by, I shall call, *Gods charging Adams sin upon his Posterity to their Condemnation*, his *Imputing* it to them: And then because I cannot neither devise with my self, how *one man* should possibly be made *Righteous* by the Obedience of *another*, but that *others Obedience* must *some way or other* become his own; and because to say Christs Obedience is ours by *Imitation of his Example*, is to cross the *Apostles parallel*, and to cross the Truth, for we Imitate it but in *part* and very *Imperfectly*; therefore I shall take the Freedom also to call Gods *constituting Believers righteous by the Obedience of Christ*, his *Imputing* that Obedience to them for their Justification: provided always, that when more convenient and expressive Terms shall be found out, to satisfy the Apostle, this of *Imputation* be left indifferent: Well, but if not these, who are then? Why *those who have received the abundance of Grace, and of the Gift of Righteousness*; these are *justified by Christ*, these shall *Reign with him in Life*: It's very true, the Apostle does tell us no less: And I cannot imagine how he should more fitly describe a *justified person*, that others may know him, and he should know himself, than by the *Fruits and Effects* of Justification; such as *abundance of Grace* are: For whatever our Author thinks of the Apostle, he does not use to describe a thing by it *self*, or something *equally obscure*, but by that which is *more known and Obvious* than the thing described: and therefore the

the Apostle seems not to describe Justification, but a justified Person by Sanctification; *They that have received abundance of Grace, and the Gift of Righteousness*, these are justified Persons; not that Justification is from any *Inherent work*, but that the justified Person is only known to himself to be such, by an *Inherent work*, and to others by the fruits of it.

This answer, I will deal truly with my Reader, came next to hand, I had it from our Author, and I presumed he would accept a bad one of his own, before a better of another mans: *The Apostle* (says he) *tells who those are that are thus justified by Christ*; Nay then, thought I, that will kill no body; for a justified Person may be described by his *Qualifications*, and yet his *Righteousness*, wherein he stands accepted before God, not consist in those Qualifications: But to deal plainly with him, I do humbly conceive, that the Apostle describes an *Imputed Righteousness* by that expression; *They which receive the abundance of Grace, and the Gift of Righteousness*: *Οἱ τὴν ἀφάνειαν τῆς χάριτος, καὶ τῆς δωρεᾶς τῆς δικαιοσύνης λαμβάνοντες*. It was the over-flowing and Redundancy of Divine Love, to accept a Surety to fulfill all Righteousness, and Suffer for us; and abundance of Grace too, to let us in by Faith into the Righteousness of Christ's Life, and the Sacrifice of Christ's Death: God might have held us close, and tyed us up to the Terms of the Old Covenant, and righteously have exacted of us a Personal compleat Obedience to every jot and tittle of the Law, as the Condition of Justification; but though he has not abated of his Law, yet he has admitted a Surety, called therefore the Surety of the Covenant; not only be-
cause

cause he has undertaken for God, but for us also; for a Mediator is not of one, Gal. 3. 19. And our receiving this abundance of Grace, is not the Receiving of inherent Grace into us, but our accepting by Faith this New Gospel-Law or Constitution of God, with the whole Man, closing with this gracious way of Justifying a Believer by Christ.

But here our Author unhappily crosses me the way with one of his *id est*'s. "That is (*says he*) Those "who by the Gospel of Christ, which is called "Grace, the abundant Grace of God, are made "Holy and Righteous. To which I say as I have sometimes said, That *the Gospel* (as he describes it) *is not the Grace of God*, but a real Doctrine of Justification by Works blanch'd a little to make it vendible. 2. The Gospel as it is a *Revelation of Grace*, is not *the whole* of the Grace of God; the Gospel reveals *more Grace* to be in God, in Christ, in the Holy Spirit for us, than the Revelation of it: There is an *Operation of Grace upon us*, a *Constitution of Grace with us*, as well as a *Revelation of Grace to us*; but this he will grant us, That *Righteousness is called a Gift*: so far good. But is it really a gift, or only called so; as Christ is called a Redeemer, called a High-Priest, called a Sacrifice? I doubt this will prove nothing but *Phraseology* at last: He answers, 1. Negatively: *It's called a gift, because it is not owing solely to Humane Endeavours*. Not solely? But then it may be almost, and very near altogether owing to *Humane Endeavours*: The Grace of God may come in for a share, though a poor pitiful share: as he would not exclude the Righteousness of Christ wholly, totally, from having any concernment in our *Justification*; so out of his generosity

say he will not shut out Grace wholly, from interpo-
 sing in our Sanctification. *Herebit in aliquâ saltem*
parte: Well, commend me to the memory of honest
 J. C. who, though a high trotting *Arminian*, would
 allow Free-grace ninety nine parts in the Conversion
 of a sinner, provided always, and upon Condition
 nevertheless, that Free-will might have one in a hun-
 dred: But what a Company of Rigid Bigots are
 these Calvinists, that will not abate one ace, not for-
 go a single Unite in a Hundred? but they pretend
 they have no Commission to compound between Free-
 grace, and Free-will, and that God will not put his
 Right to arbitration: and indeed it were hazardous,
 for what sad terms had our Author made for the
 Rich effectual Grace of God, had the determination
 been put into his hands? *Righteousness is not owing*
solely to Humane endeavours: Natural strength, free-
 will, humane ability, shall have *ninety nine parts* in
 the Dividend; and Grace that *deserves all*, must be
 content with *one single lot*, and perhaps a smaller
 assistance. And now what if this will not denomi-
 nate it a gift? just so much as you add to these Hu-
 mane Endeavours, you *subtract from free-grace*;
 and whether that little, that very little concern, that
 Grace has in this work, shall denominate it a Gift; or
 that much, that very much which Humane Endeavours
 have in it, No gift; must stand to the Courte-
 sie of the Criticks, and great Masters of Language.
 2. Affirmatively: *It is wrought in us* (says he) by
supernatural means, by those powerful arguments and
motives, and Divine assistances, which God in infi-
nite Love hath afforded the World by Jesus Christ.
 I cannot express the transport of my mind at the first
 sound of these words; *supernatural means, power-*
ful

ful arguments, *Divine assistances*; I began to suspect our Author was turn'd Calvinist, as he suspected Dr. Owen was turn'd Arminian, and with equal Reason; for I presently found my Error. The word *Grace* has a *Considerable Name*, and carries a good *repute* in the Scriptures; and therefore our Author will behave himself as *decently* towards it, as he can afford. But what is the meaning of these *supernatural means*? Why, to speak liquidly, Means of *Supernatural Revelation* at best, but of no *supernatural Operation*: Some arguments suggested, which the *light of Nature* could not discover; and some institutions, which depend merely on the will and pleasure of God: for his powerful arguments, and *Divine assistances*, they are such Motives as being given by God *externally*, are left to the self-determining power of that great Idol, Free-will: For when all is done, 'tis the man who *Converts himself*: but this, and a great deal more, will not satisfy the claim of *effectual Grace* in the Conversion of a Soul to God: Who by the same power whereby Christ was raised from the dead, works Faith in the Soul, Eph. 3. 19; 20. Who works in us both to will and to do, of his own good pleasure, Phil. 2. 13. Who gives us the new Heart, and causes us to walk in his Statutes, Ezek. 36. 26. Who takes away the resistibility of the Soul, the stony heart, and Circumcises the Hearts of his People to Love the Lord their God with all their heart, Deut. 30. 6. But with such Cantings did Pelagius cover his abominations, talking of ineffable grace, wonderful grace, when all was but Revelation, or Grace the Name, suborned to destroy Free and effectual Grace the thing it self.

After all these windings and turnings, our Author will

will give us a fair account, *How we may be said to be made Righteous by the Righteousness of Christ*: I hope it shall be an *honest account*, as well as a *fair one*, and then it's welcome; but whose hopes could have been so vain as to flatter him, he should live to see an account, and a *fair account* too, given by our Author, of such a Paradox? But we attend; *Not that his Actual Obedience is reckoned as done by us, which is impossible*. There's the Negative: And this seems to go a great way in the Account, "How we may be said to be made Righteous by anothers Righteousness? Because it's impossible we should be righteous by anothers righteousness: But why is this so impossible? There's no more impossibility in it, than that *Adams Disobedience* should be reckoned as mine; which if it be not, let men shift, and evade, with all their cunning, they shall never be able to justify Gods procedure with his Posterity, in *entailing evils, many evils, and Death it self upon them, for Adams sake*, if they be not *guilty of the Crime*. Suppose we had been in *Adams place*, had committed his sin, *eaten the forbidden Fruit*, in his stead, in our own Persons, what had the penalty been in our Authors Judgment; but *evils, a great many evils, Death it self*? And what in the Apostles account but *Judgment unto Condemnation*? If then the penalty of sin may be *inflicted*, there's a necessity that the *guilt of the sin be imputed*: It's impossible indeed, that we should *Personally have committed Adams sin*, or performed that *very Obedience* which Christ performed, but not impossible (according to the *Constitution of the Law of the two Covenants*, made with the first and second Adam) that the *Disobedience of the one*, or *Obedience of the other*, should be reckoned

reckoned as committed, or performed by us: And when the Apostle shall expressly tell us, That by *one mans Offence we are made Sinners*; Death is passed upon us, judgement come upon all to condemnation; and therefore, and in the same way, by the *Obedience of one, many are made righteous*; I shall see very good Reason before I quit my Faith, and renounce the Apostle, upon an idle Tale of I know not what impossibilities.

Secondly, Affirmatively: Because we are made righteous both in a proper, and a Forensick sence, by the Gospel Covenant, which is wholly owing to the Grace of God, and to the Merits and Righteousness of Christ. I see now how hard it is to get our Authors Mind out of him: P. 320. The Covenant of Grace was then "Owing to the Sacrifice of Christs Death, and the Righteousness of his Life: And P. 334. "God for Christs sake made a New Covenant of Grace: But now it's "Wholly owing to "the Grace of God, and the Merits and Righteousness of Christ: So that,

1. If the Grace of God, and the Righteousness of Christ, be Con-causes of the Covenant, and yet their proper concerns are not distinctly meted and bounded out; he may allow as small a share to the Righteousness of Christ in procuring the Covenant, as he allows the Power of God in Conversion: Righteousness is not owing solely to Humane Endeavours; well, it may not be wholly and solely owing, and yet within a very small trifle it may be wholly and solely owing to them; so here: This Covenant is wholly owing to Gods Grace, and the Merits and Righteousness of Christ, but how small a little finger Christ

Christ may have in it, is a Secret, and till an ad-
measurement be made, will be so.

2. This *Covenant* is wholly owing to the *Grace* of God, &c. Now what he understands by the *Grace* of God, he has often told us: *Pag. 322. The Grace of God is the Gospel: And pag. 334. The Gospel is the Grace, and abundant Grace of God:* And the summe of this *Gospel* in words at length, and not in Figures, is, *A Promise of Pardon and Life to them that believe, and obey the Gospel;* and then the short and long of this Business is, That the *Covenant* is owing to the *Covenant*, or the *Gospel* is owing to the *Gospel*, or the *Grace* of God is owing to the *Grace* of God.

3. The *Grace* of God, and the *Merits* of Christ are here assigned as Con-causes of this *Covenant*; Now if it be of *Merit*, how is it of *Grace*? if of *Grace*, how is it of *Merit*? I can easily understand how Christ should merit *Pardon* and *Life* for me, and yet that this should be of mere *Grace* from God, to admit anothers *Merits* to procure those Blessings for me, which I cannot procure to my self: But I acknowledge my own weakness, I cannot understand, How this *Covenant* of his should be owing both to *Merit*, and *Free-grace*; that is, How God should make a *Promise* to pardon freely, without any *Consideration* of making the *Promise*, and yet Christ should merit it at Gods hands, which implies a *valuable consideration*. But thus it must be, when men to save the Lives of two or three sorry Crotchets, will forsake the Conduct of the Scriptures, and lean to their own Understandings; for the Scripture assures us, that *Free-grace* is the only Foundation of the *Covenant* of *Grace*, and that Christ himself

is the Gift of God, Joh. 4. 10. who by the Righteousness of his Life, the Sacrifice of his Death, the Power and Prevalency of his Intercession, admits us into all the Grace, and Mercy, and Benefits of that Covenant, with Security to Gods Honour, and the Repute of all his Attributes. But;

4. This is *no fair or tolerable Account*, How we may be said to be made righteous by the righteousness of Christ, because the Covenant is owing to his Righteousness, (if it had been owing to it;) for, as fair an Account may be given, How we may be said to be made righteous by the Virgin Mary. If we may be said to be made righteous by any thing, to which that thing is owing by which we are really made righteous, then we may be said to be made righteous by the Virgin Mary: We are properly made righteous (according to our Author) by our own Obedience; that this Obedience makes us so, is owing to the Covenant; that Covenant is owing to the Obedience of Christ; his Obedience is owing to his Nativity; his Nativity to his Mother; and that may be run up in the Genealogical Scale as high as Adam; and thus at this rate, we may be said to be justified by Adam. And for this he has wisely made a reserve: *A fair Account how we may be said; that's All.* Not that we are so, but that we may be said to be so; and the Mystery of it lyes here. The Scripture has said, that we are made righteous by Christs Obedience; and we take it for granted, that the Scripture had not said it, unless it had been really true: but there are some, who do not believe it to be really true; and therefore they must set their wits awork, to find out how it may possibly be said to be true, and yet not really be so; that so they may

may neither throw the Lye directly in the face of the Apostles, nor yet be compelled to wave their own Unbelief.

But it seems there is a two-fold sence in which we may be said to be made righteous by the Gospel-Covenant.

1. Sect. *A Proper Sence*; which is this. The great Arguments, and Motives, and powerfull Assurances of the Gospel, form our Minds to the love and practise of Holiness, and so make us inherently righteous. What needed all this posher and stir to no purpose? The Righteousness of Christ contributes something, (though he cannot tell what) to the Gospel-Covenant; this Gospel-Covenant contains, Promises and Duties, or Motives, Arguments, Reasons to Obedience; now when these Promises prevail with us to love and practise those Duties, to perform that Obedience, then we become inherently righteous in a proper sence; and so that none may take it ill, they shall have liberty to say, that we are made righteous by the righteousness of Christ: His Righteousness or Obedience was an excellent Pattern of, a strong Motive to our being righteous. Two things I shall oppose to this.

(1.) That to be made inherently righteous, is not the proper sence of being made righteous: This was indeed the proper sence of being Righteous under the Covenant of Works; when a perfect, exact, compleat inherent Holiness, was the Matter of Justification before God; and when it was attainable; and it shall be once more the proper sence of being made righteous in Heaven, where the spirits of just men are made perfectly perfect; but to us, in the way, it's not the proper sence of being made righteous, but

a Figurative sence, as we may call an Æthiopian white, because *his teeth* are so; and it must be a stretching Synecdoche that will denominate a Christian Righteous by inherent Righteousness, if he shall compare the Attainments of a Pilgrim with the perfect Law of God; but the proper sence of being made righteous, is that of the Apostle, Rom. 5. 20. *By the Obedience of one Man many shall be made righteous*; made so perfectly and compleatly by the Constitution of the Law of Righteousness and Faith: for thus we are compleat in Christ, Coloss. 2. 10. through whom we are presented to God, ἀμώμους, ἡ ἀνεγκλίτους; unblameable, and unproveable in Gods sight: so pure, that there is not a spot or blemish to be found in a Believer in the sight of God himself; which upon the Account of inherent Righteousness, is impossible. Inherent Righteousness is properly Righteousness (for so much as there is of it,) but it is so imperfect, that it will not denominate any man properly righteous in the sight of God.

(2) There is another thing which mightily discomposes this kind of Argumentation: "We may be said to be made righteous by the Righteousness of Christ in a proper sence. *Why so? Oh!* Because the Righteousness of Christ is one of those great Arguments of the Gospel that forms our Minds to the Love and practice of Holiness, and so makes us inherently righteous. Which is this; The Righteousness of Christ, and our Righteousness, hang so loosely and contingently together, that it seems very absurd, to ascribe the Effect of the latter to the former: If indeed the Righteousness of Christ did properly, necessarily, and infallibly produce an inherent Righteousness in us, it were

were warrantable to say, we were made righteous by it ; but when the Connexion is so accidental, so uncertain, that the Effect depends upon *our own Free-will* (as in the New Théology it does) we cannot properly be said to be made righteous in *this sence by his Righteousness* : For when all these Arguments and Motives have done their best, That which does the work, is, *Free-will and Humane Endeavour* ; and therefore properly are we said to be made Righteous by them.

2. Sect. *A Forensick sence* ; which is this. *The Grace of the Gospel accepts and rewards that sincere and Evangelical Obedience, which according to the Rigour and Severity of the Law, could deserve no reward.* This Forensick, is a hard word ; and if I might presume to soften it a little with Interpretation, it should be thus : A Forensick sence of Justification, is a sence borrowed from Courts of Judicature, where the Judge absolving or acquitting a Prisoner of those Crimes wherewith he stood charged, does not doe it by *making him innocent or honest*, by *infusing* into him the Habits of Vertue ; but onely *declares*, That according to the Evidence he is found Innocent, Righteous, Just, and therefore, *as the Law acquits him*, so the Judge as the Minister of the Law *declares him to be acquitted*. Now the Question is, Whether our Author has given us a *true Forensick sence of Justification*, or no ? His Sence is this : *The Grace of the Gospel accepts, and rewards that sincere and Evangelical Obedience, which according to the Severity and Rigour of the Law, deserves no reward* : which seems to me so far from a *Forensick sence*, that it's the *Forensick Non-sence* of Justification ; for does a

Y y 3 Judge

Judge pronounce and declare him *righteous*, whom the Law says, is *unrighteous*? Can he justify him whom the Law condemns? The Judge sits not there as a good Natur'd Man, with a Chancery of Charity in his own breast, but as a *Righteous Governour*, to render to every man according to his works, weighed in the Ballance of that Law by which he is to judge: And shall we dare to fancy, that the *Grace of the Gospel* will pronounce that Man *righteous*, reward that Man as *righteous*, who is not *righteous* by the Law of God, if that be the Law by which he must be Condemned or Acquitted? I will grant, that in a *Criminal Cause*, which by the Law deserves *Bodily Punishment*, if the *Constitution of the Law* will Allow it, the Judge may lay the *Punishment* of the Guilty Person upon another who will freely undergoe it, or that which is equivalent in the eye of the Law to it; and acquit him, that in the first Consideration of the Law was not innocent: Let us apply it. God is the *righteous Judge* of all the World; and by his *Eternal Holy Law* he will Judge the Sons of Men; so true is God to his own Law, that he will not acquit and justify him whom the Law condemns, nor Condemn him whom his Law Acquits, nor is it possible he should: To say the Sinner is *righteous* by the Verdict of his Law, when by the Verdict of the Law he is not righteous, is not consistent with the *Veracity* of that God who cannot lye: But there is another Law, the Law of *Righteousnesse and Faith*, which Sovereign Grace has set up, and this admits the satisfaction of Another, admits a Sacrifice, a Surety, even Jesus Christ the righteous, whom God hath set forth to be a Propitiation through Faith in his Blood, to declare

declare his Righteousness, that he may be just, and the Justifier of him that believes in Jesus: If now according to the Terms of this New Law of Grace, the Righteousness and Sufferings of this Jesus may be accepted for the Delinquents, then will there a genuine sence of a Forensick Justification be found out. Yet let us examine these things further:

[1] *The Grace of the Gospel* (says he) *accepts and rewards that sincere Obedience*. Let it be supposed he means the Grace of God, declared in the Gospel; yet this is so far from being Grace, that it is not good *Moral Vertue*: Is that Grace, or something that deserves *Another Name*, to declare an Offender to be *righteous* when he is not so? to pronounce he has *kept the Law*, when he has broken it? and yet thus must the *Grace of the Gospel* speak, if it declares him *righteous in a Forensick sence*, who is a *Violator of the Law*, and yet has no *Substitute* to keep it for him: Here is some Provision made for an *Imaginary Grace*, to the destruction of *real Justice*; whereas, in the true Covenant of Grace there is a blessed Accord of all Gods Attributes, *Mercy and Truth* have met together, *Righteousness and Peace* have kissed each other.

[2] If it be the *Grace of God, or the Gospel*, that accepts this *sincere Obedience*, then how do we owe this to the *Righteousness of Christ*? what Influence has that upon God, to move him to accept and reward that *sincere, yet imperfect Obedience*, which his Law will not accept? This is the thing that remains in the Clouds still, and upon our Authors Hypothesis must lodge there Eternally.

[3] Our Author fancies a *Rigour and Severity*

in the Law; now what that should be, is not easily conceivable: Is it *any* of the Ten Commandments which is so rigorous above the rest? *which* is it? or *how many* are there of them? and *where* has God, *dispensed with them*, or *is*? or *what part* of the Law is it, the *external* or the *internal part*, wherein the *Rigour of the Law* lies? or is it *no certain thing*, but left to Discretion? such as hath *a latitude*, in some greater, in some less? or rather, is not *this Rigour of the Law* (as 'tis here applyed) a great Name of Blasphemy, and reproach against the Law; and therein the Law-giver, all whose Commands, and every part and parcel thereof, *are holy, just, and good*? And in a word, if God can dispence with his Law, and indulge the Violation of it, what Reason can be given, why he may not dispence with *all the rest*? Why so he may, if our Author say true, p. 45. "That part of Justice which consists in Punishing Offenders, was alwayes look'd on as an Instrument of Government, and therefore the exacting, or remitting Punishment, was referred to the Wisdom of Governours, who might Spare or Punish as they saw Reason, without being unjust in either. And therefore he concludes, There was no Necessity for such a Sacrifice as the Death of Christ, for the Expiation of Sin.

He is now drawing his Conclusion, and I hope will draw to a Conclusion. *So that our Righteousness is wholly owing to the Righteousness of Christ.* I am in hope it will be owing to something before he has done. A little before, it was owing (not solely indeed, but almost) *to humane Endeavours*, and now the Debt is transferred, *wholly to the Righteousness*

ousness of Christ. And yet he flies higher in his Complements, to the Righteousness of Christ: Which (says he) in this sense may be said to be Imputed to us, because without this Covenant which is founded on the Righteousness of Christ, the best man Living could lay no claim to Righteousness or future Glory. And is it come to this? Is there a sense, wherein the Righteousness of Christ may be said to be Imputed to us? And must all men be Reviled and Persecuted with Scurrility, because they cannot Jump just into his Sense? And yet the sense of this way of Imputation is Invisibile: VVas it not possible for God to pardon without respect to Christ? O yes! Could he not reward sincere Obedience without regard to Christ? O yes! Could he not accept him that walkt uprightly before him; without any consideration had of Christs Righteousness? Oh yes! Could not God have promised to do all this, as well as do it without a promise? No doubt of that: VVhy then might not the best man Living lay claim to that which God promised, upon performance of the condition of which he promised it? Yes, indeed he might, had God promised it; but before the appearance of Christ in the Flesh, he made no such promise: VVell then, all we have got by the Bargain is a promise that God will do that now, which he always would have done, and did do (though not promise that he would do) before the appearance of Christ, and if he never had appeared. If then this be the only sense in which Christs Righteousness may be said to be imputed to us; it may be said to be imputed in no sense at all; for it gives us no right upon which we may make a claim, only an evidence of right, whereby we may lay claim to Righteousness

ness and future Glory: But why might not the best man living lay claim to Righteousness and future Glory? Why, he supposes there was no such Covenant in the World before the appearance of Christ; and he supposes that this Covenant was founded upon the Obedience, and Sacrifice of Christ. Here must needs be a great mistake.

1. Upon his own Principles. For pag. 252. he asserts, That *Natural Religion is founded upon Natural Demonstrations, that God is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him: And that upon this Foundation, Abel and Enoch, proceeded in their serving of God, pag. 253. And that they pleased God by their Obedience, the Apostle assures us, Heb. 11. 4, 5. And that Abel obtained witness that he was Righteous: And that Enoch before his Translation had this Testimony, that he pleased God.* Now that which God Spoke by *Natural Demonstration*, to that, upon their *diligent seeking of Him*, they might lay claim; but God Spoke by *Natural Demonstration*, that he was a *Rewarder of them that diligently seek Him*, therefore to that Reward they might lay claim: Yes, no doubt, a claim to that Reward, But what was that? A meer Temporal transitory Reward. And was that all the Reward that righteous Abel was to have for his Sacrifice, for his serving of God? Doubtless, for he was presently Murder'd for it. And was that all the reward that holy Enoch might claim? Doubtless, for God took him, Translated him to a better Life, for before his Translation, he received this Testimony that he pleased God.

2. There's a mistake upon better Principles: That which God Spoke by Revelation, to that they might

might
Rev
him,
on h
claim
our
what
diffic
baw
well
were
nal
But
the
preh
prom
coul
whe
Hin
Epit
that
out
Sum
pel,
be t
us t
He
shal
thei
are
pre
3
Spin
to;

might lay claim; but God Spoke to *Abraham* by Revelation, that upon his *walking uprightly* before him, He would *be his God*; therefore *Abraham* upon his walking uprightly before God, might lay claim to it, that *God should be his God*. Ay, (says our Author) *Be his God*: No doubt of that: But what does that signifie? This was one of the great difficulties that lay in his way, to believe that *Abraham was justified by Christ*. For then, *We must be well assured, that the Blessings promised to Abraham were Spiritual Blessings, pardon of Sin, and Eternal Life*: And therefore this is *Ignoratio Elenchi*: But I profess my Name on the other side. And that the Promise that *God would be Abrahams God*, comprehended all that ever God Promised, or could promise to any of the Sons of Men: When God could Swear by *no greater*, he Swore by *Himself*; and when he could promise *nothing greater*, he promised *Himself*: *I will be thy God*, is the Abstract and Epitome of the whole Covenant of Grace: 'Tis that Gold in the Lump, which was afterwards beaten out into *greater breadth*, but still of the *same weight*. Summe up all the particular Promises in the Gospel, and the *total Summe* is no more than this; *I will be thy God*. And therefore when the Apostle gives us the Covenant of Grace, *Heb. 8. 10, 11, 12*. He describes it thus, *I will be their God, and they shall be my People*: That he will *Write his Laws in their Hearts*, that he will *pardon their Iniquities*, are some of the particulars included in that comprehensive Promise, *I will be their God*.

3. That which the Saints guided by the Infalible Spirit laid claim to, that they might justly lay claim to; but the Saints guided by the Infalible Spirit, laid

laid claim to an *Eternal Reward*; therefore to that Reward they might justly lay claim, Psal. 73. 24. *Thou shalt guide me with thy Counsel,* (here below in my Passage and Pilgrimage) *and afterwards* (when I have run my Race, and finisht my Course) *receive me to Glory.*

The Epilogue to the whole is this: "The Righteousness of Christ is our Righteousness, when we speak of the Foundation of the Covenant, by which we are accepted; but if we speak of the Termes of the Covenant, then we must have a Righteousness of our own: The Righteousness of Christ will not serve the turn; Christs Righteousness and our own are both necessary to Salvation: The first as the Foundation of the Covenant, the other as the Condition of it.

Two things are here asserted: First, that *Christs Righteousness is the Foundation of the Covenant*: Secondly, that *our Righteousness is the Condition of the Covenant*. A brief Examination of which things, shall ease the Reader of any further attendance upon these Discourses.

[1.] *The Righteousness of Christ is the Foundation of the Covenant of Grace*: Let us hear his Proofs; not a word: *Peralta est hac Fabula Spectatores valete & plaudite.* We have heard of *Procuring, Meriting, Founding a Covenant*, but not a syllable of *Evidence*: Methinks I see the Reader filled with *shame and wonder*; wonder, that he who could so pleasantly scoff at the Scripture Expressions of *building upon Christ as on a Foundation*, p. 105. and so merrily inveigh against Dr. Owen for asserting Christ to be the only Foundation of our Communion with God, should now so zealously talk for Christs

Christs being the Foundation of the Covenant; and shame, that after such expectations of Proof, he should find himself balk'd in the stock. That the Reader may not wholly therefore lose his pains, I shall entertain him with my own apprehensions in this matter.

The Covenant of Grace may be considered either in its *Constitution*, or *Execution*: The Constitution of the Covenant is Gods *firm and unchangeable purpose of saving his Elect, to the praise of his glorious Grace*: For the word Covenant, which in the English Notion has seduced our Understandings, in the Hebrew בְּרִית and the Greek Διαθήκη, by which the Spirit of God expresses those things to us, signify a *disposition, appointment, or ordering of Matters*; whether there be *restitution* or no: Thus the fixed purpose, the determinate Counsel of God in Scripture is called a *Covenant*, though the things about which that Διαθήκη, or Counsel of God is conversant be not capable of re-promising any thing, and have onely an *Obediential Capacity* in them answering the absolute extraordinary Power of God. Thus Jer. 33. 20. *If you can break my Covenant of the day, and my Covenant of the night, that there should not be day and night in their Season, ver. 25. Thus saith the Lord, If my Covenant be not with day and night, and if I have not appointed the Ordinances of Heaven; where Gods fixed Law concerning the Succession of Day and Night to the period of all time, is called his Covenant; and which is still more to our purpose, by the stability of this grand Law of Nature, he is pleased to instruct us in the fixedness of his better Covenant, that of Grace, ver. 21. Then may also my Covenant be broken with Da-*

vid

vid my *Servant*, ver. 26. *Then will I cast away the Seed of Jacob, and David my Servant.* This purpose of God, this disposition of Grace is *immutable*, Rom. 9. 11. *That the purpose of God according to Election might stand.* The *Execution* of this fixed Constitution follows: which is Gods *wise and gracious managing* of all things for the accomplishment of *that glorious design*, which he had in the prospect of his *Eternal Counsel*, which he *steddily* and *regularly* pursues through all the vicissitudes that his *mutable Creature* was obnoxious to, whilst man stood, God pursued his Counsel in giving him a Holy Law to guide him, Seconded and back'd with promises and threatnings; when Man with-drew from God, yet God could *not deny himself*, but devolves this great Affair into the hand of a *Mediator*, who with equal readiness and satisfaction in that Seed that should be given him as the purchase of his undertaking, addresses himself to this glorious work of *Recovering* them back again to God; and when the fulness of time was come, took upon him our Nature, partook of our Flesh and Blood, because the *Children* whom God had committed to him were *partakers of it*: This Redeeming Mediator undertakes *with God as a Righteous Judge*, that he may not lose the glory of *any of his Attributes*, and *unto God as a Father*, that he shall not lose *any of the Children* that he had given him; and therefore he becomes a Priest, a Sacrifice; a price of Ransom, a Curse, to satisfy the Judge and his Law; and a Prophet and King to recover us *Actually* in our state to God. Thus is he *the onely Foundation*, 1. Cor. 3. 12. The Foundation, *not of the Constitution*, but of the *Execution of the Covenant*.

1: On

1. On Gods part; whatever grace and mercy was in his *eternal* purpose, that is *given out to us* by Jesus Christ: The Promises are made by *free-grace* as their Reason, but made good by Jesus Christ, as the means of procuring the promised Mercy, which had been forfeited; for all the promises of God in him are yea, and Amen, 2 Cor. 1. 20. He accepts us in the beloved, Eph. 1. 6. Forgives us through him, ver. 7. Justifies us by Christ, Rom. 3. 24. Sanctifies, and saves us by Christ, Tit. 3. 4, 5, 6. And,

2. On our part; through him we approach to God, John 14. 6. Heb. 10. 19, 20. By him we believe in God, 1 Pet. 1. 21. He is our hope of Glory, Col. 1. 27. He is the ground of our Faith, the Foundation upon which our Souls are laid, 1 Pet. 2. 5. To whom coming as to a living stone, we also as lively stones are built up a Spiritual house: Thus is he the Foundation of conveying all the blessings of the Covenant to us, Eph. 1. God blesseth us with all Spiritual blessings in Christ: but that Christ is the Foundation of the Covenant is self, that I crave leave to deny, and to render the Reasons of my denial.

1. Self. Christ cannot be the Foundation of the Covenant, because Christ himself is promised in the Covenant, as the great Comprehensive Blessing of the Covenant, Isa. 49. 8, 9. I will give thee for a Covenant, that thou maist say to the Prisoners, go forth, to them that are in darkness, shew your selves. Whence it's evident, first, that the free-love of the Father is the Reason of his giving his Son to be our Deliverer; Secondly, that Christ is the great undertaker to Execute that Counsel of God in our actual

De-

Deliverance, Luke 1. 68. Blessed be the Lord God of Israel, who hath Visited, and Redeemed his People, and hath raised up a Horn of Salvation in the House of his Servant David, as he spake by the mouth of his Holy Prophets which have been since the world began, --- ver. 72. To perform the Mercy promised to our Fathers, and to remember his holy Covenant, the Oath which he sware to our Father Abraham; where the firm Oath and Covenant of God to Redeem his People is assigned as the Reason of his giving Christ to be a Redeemer. The places are too many to be insisted on that confirm this Truth. John 3. 16. 1 John 4. 9, 10.

2. *Self.* Free grace is given as the true Reason of the Covenant of Grace, Heb. 8. 8. For finding fault with them, he saith, behold the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a New Covenant with the House of Israel, &c. They were a faulty, an undeserving, an ill-deserving People, yet Free grace will make a Covenant with them: Nor is there any opposition between Free-grace and Christs Merits in this Case: if we consider that Free-grace is the Original Reason of Gods designation, and purpose to bestow the good things of the Covenant; and the Righteousness of Christs Life, and the Sacrifice of his Death the way of recovering these Mercies, which by sin had been forfeited and lost.

3. *Self.* The Scriptures give us no intimation that Christ is the Foundation of Gods making this Covenant, or the Original Reason of Gods design to bestow the Mercies of the Covenant, though it abounds with Testimonies that Christ is the way of procuring for

for us, and conveying to us these intended mercies; and in those things which depend upon mere good pleasure, Revelation must be our *only guide*: In this case we may conclude *Negatively*, *Non credimus quia non legimus*: And we may shrewdly conjecture that there is no pretence from Scripture for this *Figment* of our Authors, because it's the *Foundation* of all his mistakes, and yet he has not so much as attempted the *perverting* of one Scripture to give colour to it, which may be reckoned amongst the *Admiranda Nili*.

[2.] His other Assertion is this, *Our own Righteousness is the condition of the Covenant*, which with his former Assertion is obtruded upon us without proof, and therefore I suppose he intends they must both be maintained at the Charges of the *Parish*: Now,

1, It is agreed, for ought I know, that an inherent righteousness is a necessary condition of eternal Salvation, Heb. 12. 14. *Without Holiness no man shall see God*. It is a Condition in the Covenant, though not of the Covenant; such a Condition, as is due to every Person in a Covenant-state; it doth necessarily attend that state, though it be not allowed as antecedent to a Covenant-state.

2. As to the Constitution of the Covenant in Gods purpose and Counsel, I know no condition at all. They that talk of the right use of free-will, future Faith, or good works fore-seen as the Reason of that purpose, talk without book, and onely intimate what a rare Covenant they would have made for us, had they had the modelling, and Contrivance of it; like him that boasted, that if he had stood by God when he formed Man, he could have told him, how to have

made him more commodiously, Rom. 9. 11. *The Children being not yet born, neither having done any good, or evil.* Where those words [neither having done any good, or evil,] must necessarily exclude all respect to the future good or evil they should do, (as the Reason of the purpose of God according to Election :) because it's evident by the form of speech. That they deny something more concerning the Children, than the former words, [being not yet born] and yet even they exclude, Having done good or evil *Actually*.

3. The Question then is, whether "An inherent Righteousness be the Condition required of us and "in us, antecedent to our first Covenant-state? And I durst leave this Matter to be determined by the Church of England, if our Author would do so too: *Art. 17. Predestination to Life is the everlasting purpose of God, whereby before the Foundation of the World was laid, he hath constantly decreed by his Counsel secret to us, to deliver from Curse and Damnation, those whom he hath chosen out of Mankind in Christ, and to bring them by Christ to everlasting Salvation; whence we are taught,*

1. That Election is not of *all Mankind*, but of *some* out of Mankind.

2. That this purpose of God was from everlasting.

3. That it is a *fixed constant* decree.

4. That the Design of it is to *deliver* those chosen out of Mankind, *from the curse*, under which Mankind was fallen: and to *bring* them to *everlasting Salvation*.

5. That the Reason of this eternal Election was *his own counsel*.

6. That

6. That *the Execution of this Decree is in and by Jesus Christ*; and the manner of it follows. "Wherefore they which be endued with so excellent a benefit, be called according to the purpose of God; working in due season by his Spirit. They through Grace obey the calling, they be justified freely, they be made the Sons of God by Adoption, they be made like the Image of his onely begotten Son, they walk Religiously in good works, and at length by Gods mercy, they attain everlasting felicity. Whence we are Instructed,

1. That *the calling of the Elect to a Covenant-state is from Grace as the reason, and by Grace as it's efficient.*

2. Their *obeying that call of God is by Grace.*

3. Good works necessarily follow effectual calling: See also *Art. 10. 12, 13.*

4. Religious walking with God in good works is *a necessary condition of eternal Felicity.*

5. That there is such a *firm connexion in this golden chain of Salvation, that no one linck can possibly be broken*: They are *Elect* freely, called effectually, justified freely, Adopted graciously, Sanctified gradually, walk Religiously, and at length by the mercy of God are saved eternally, which the Apostle gives us more concisely, *Rom. 8. 30. Moreover whom he did Predestinate, them he also called; and whom he called, them he also justified; and whom he justified, them he also Glorified*: I conclude then that *our own righteousness is not the condition of the Covenant of Grace, neither of the designment of the Father, nor the procurement of the Son, nor of the effectual Operation of the Holy Spirit, nor of our Covenant-state, nor of our Covenant-right, nor of*

the first Covenant-mercy; but of many after-mercies, and of *Eternal Salvation* it is the condition.

1. *Señ.* That is not the Condition of the Covenant required of us on our part, which God promises to work in us on His part; but God has promised to work in us Inherent-righteousness, both Root and Fruit, *Ezek.* 36. 26, 27. *A new Heart also will I give you, and I will put my Spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my Statutes, and ye shall keep my Judgments, and do them.*

2. *Señ.* That which God in Covenant bestows, cannot be the Condition of a Covenant-state, but God in Covenant bestows the new Heart, for new Obedience, *Deut.* 30. 6. *The Lord thy God will Circumcise thy Heart, to love the Lord thy God with all thy Heart, and with all thy Soul.*

3. *Señ.* That which presupposes other Covenant-mercies antecedent to it, cannot be the condition of the first Covenant-Blessing, and therefore not the condition of a Covenant-state: but our own righteousness presupposes other Covenant-blessings antecedent to it; *Ezek.* 36. 26. *I will take away the Heart of stone out of your Flesh, and give you an Heart of Flesh: the Natural Heart must be Circumcised, the hard heart removed, a soft heart bestowed before we can perform new Obedience, out of which our own righteousness results.* When therefore our Author says, *That Christs righteousness and our own are both necessary to Sa'vation:* He says true, and (which is necessary to all Truth) that which overthrows his main design. For if Christs righteousness be necessary to our Salvation, (not onely to the promise

mise of it) then *no Salvation* can be had without *that righteousness*: but if it be onely necessary to a *promise* of that Salvation, then it is *not necessary to Salvation*; for Salvation (according to his Principles) has been obtained *without a promise of Salvation*, (otherwise the Patriarchs before Christ could not be *eternally saved*, whom he supposes to have had *no such promise*) and so it may still; for *Obedience performed* will save, though it want *that great promise* for it's encouragement. And whereas he says, *That Christs Righteousness is the Foundation, but not the Condition of the Covenant*; what policy there may be in using the Metaphor of a Foundation I cannot tell; but this I know: A Foundation is a *necessary Condition* to the superstructure raised upon it.

I have now attended him through all the Labyrinths of this tedious Discourse, whence the Reader will learn at least how impossible it is for *Error to be Consonant to it self*: As the two Millstones grind *one another*, as well as *the grain*; and as the extreme Vices oppose *each other* as well as the *intermediate vertue* that lies between them: So have *all Errors* this fate (and 'tis the best quality they are guilty of) that they *Duel one another* with the same heat that they oppose *the Truth*. The Remainder of his Book is so full of falsehoods *in matter of fact*, reproaches of the Truth, and immerited bitterness against the Living, and the Dead, that I could not perswade my self to give the Reader any further trouble with them at present; but a small invitation will draw out the second Part: In the meantime I do solemnly protest, that as I have no Personal Quarrel with this Gentleman, so I have not willingly wronged his Discourse in the smallest instance: The worst I wish him

him is, that he may seasonably repent of his injurious dealing with the Scriptures, and his unworthy treatment of those Persons who have deserved well of Religion, and the Common-wealth of Learning, and not ill of himself: I cannot deny but that *his provoking way of writing*, his unjust censures of the Innocent, and above all, *his Drolling faculty*, exercised upon sacred things, have sometimes tempted me to a return, not so agreeable to my Natural inclinations. I hope the Reader will consider not only *how*, but *what* I have written; nor only *what*, but *upon what provocations* it has been written: Let *Cause* be compared with *Cause*, the moments of *Reasons* with *Reasons*; let the little Vagaries, and impertinences be brushed off; and then let the indifferent, and impartial Reader moderate between us: And if he shall meet with any Truth of the Gospel cleared or vindicated, let him give God the more praise, who by such improbable means, as Clay and Spittle, can open his Eyes to the acknowledgment of the Truth; and secure him against the Impostures and Apostacy of these latter times: and what ever of Vanity and Folly he meets with in these Papers, let him be assured that's *my own*; and that it may not *prejudice the concerns of Christ*, let him *freely* trample it under his Feet.

FINIS.

A G
by
ne

E
explain
Discov
the He

2. E
the Pr
ture, E
explain
the Re
Office
bout it
refuted
fourth
being

3. 1
ing th
Name,
Effects
explain
positio
of Gos
rality,
ence,
clared.

4. A
Nature
Reality
the Gu
self wit
in Qua

*A Catalogue of some Books printed, and sold
by Nath. Ponder at the Peacock in Chancery-Lane
near Fleetstreet.*

First.

Exercitations on the Epistle to the *Hebrews*; also concerning the *Messiah*: Wherein the Promises concerning Him to be a Spiritual Redeemer of Mankind, are explained and vindicated, &c. With an Exposition of, and Discourses on the two first Chapters of the said Epistle to the *Hebrews*. By *John Owen*, D. D. in *Folio*.

2. Exercitations on the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, concerning the Priesthood of Christ; wherein the original Causes, Nature, Prefigurations and Discharge of that holy Office are explained and vindicated. The Nature of the Covenant of the Redeemer, with the Call of the Lord Christ unto his Office, are declared; And the Opinions of the *Socinians* about it are fully examined, and their Oppositions unto it refuted. With a Continuation of the Exposition on the third, fourth and fifth Chapters of the said Epistle to the *Hebrews*, being the second Volumn. By *John Owen*, D. D. in *Folio*.

3. ΠΝΕΥΜΑΤΟΛΟΓΙΑ: Or, A Discourse concerning the Holy Spirit. Wherein an Account is given of his Name, Nature, Personality, Dispensation, Operations and Effects. His whole Work in the Old and New Creation is explained; the Doctrine concerning it vindicated from Oppositions and Reproaches. The Nature also, and Necessity of Gospel-Holiness; the difference between Grace and Morality, or a Spiritual Life unto God in Evangelical Obedience, and a course of Moral Vertues, are stated and declared. By *John Owen*, D. D. in *Folio*.

4. A Practical Exposition on the 130 *Psalms*: wherein the Nature of the Forgiveness of Sin is declared; the Truth and Reality of it asserted; and the Case of a Soul distressed with the Guilt of Sin, and relieved by a Discovery of Forgiveness with God, is at large discoursed. By *Jo. Owen*, D. D. in *Quarto*.

5: *Londons*

Printed and sold by N. Ponder.

5. *London Lamentations*; or, a sober, serious Discourse concerning the late *Fiery Dispensation*. By Mr. *Thomas Brooks*, late Preacher of the Word at St. *Margaret's New-Fish-street, London*, in *Quarto*.

6. *Liberty of Conscience* upon its true and proper grounds asserted and vindicated, &c. To which is added the Second Part, *viz.* Liberty of Conscience the Magistrates Interest. By a *Protestant*, a Lover of Truth, and the Peace and Prosperity of the Nation; in *Quarto*. *The second Edition*.

Large Octavo's.

7. A Discourse of the Nature, Power, Deceit and Prevalency of the Remainders of *Indwelling-Sin* in Believers. Together with the ways of its working, and means of prevention. By *John Owen*, D. D. in *Octavo*.

8. *Truth and Innocency vindicated*: in a Survey of a Discourse concerning *Ecclesiastical Policy*, and the Authority of the Civil Magistrate over the Consciences of Subjects in matters of Religion. By *John Owen*, D. D. in *Octavo*.

9. Exercises concerning the Name, Original, Nature, Use, and Continuance of a *Sacred Day of Rest*; wherein the Original of the *Sabbath* from the foundation of the World, the Morality of the fourth Commandment, with the change of the Sabbath-Day, are enquired into: Together with an Assertion of the Divine Institution of the Lord's Day. By *John Owen*, D. D. in *Octavo*. *The second Impression*.

10. *Evangelical Love, Church-Peace and Unity*. By *J. Owen*, D. D.

11. The Unreasonableness of *Atheism* made manifest: in a Discourse to a Person of Honour. By Sir *Charles Walsley*, Baronet. *Third Impression*.

12. The Reasonableness of *Scripture-Belief*. A Discourse giving some Account of those Rational Grounds upon which the Bible is received as the Word of God. Written by Sir *Charles Walsley*, Baronet.

13. *The Rehearsal transcribed*, or Animadversions upon a late Book, intitled, *A Preface*, shewing what Grounds there are of fears and jealousies of *Pogery*. *The first Part*. By *Andrew Marvel*, Esq.

14. *The*

Books printed and sold by N. Ponder.

14. *The Rehearsal transpos'd*; the Second Part. Occasioned by two Letters: the first printed by a nameless Author, intituled, *A Reproof*, &c. the second, *A Letter* left at a friends house, dated Nov. 3. 1673. subscribed *J. G.* and concluding with these words, *If thou darest to print or publish any Lye or Libel against Dr. Parker, by the Eternal God I will cut thy throat.* Answered by *Andrew Marvel*.

15. *Theopolis*, or the City of God, *New Jerusalem*; in opposition to the City of the Nations, *Great Babylon*. By *Henry D'avers*, in *Octavo*.

16. *A Guide for the Practical Gauger*; with a Compendium of Decimal Arithmetick. Shewing briefly the whole Art of Gauging of Brewers Tuns, Coppers, Backs, &c. also the Math or Oyl-Cask; and *Sybrant Hantz*, his Table of Area's of Segments of a Circle; the Mensuration of all manner of Superficies. By *William Hunt*, Student in the Mathematicks, in *Octavo*.

17. *Anti-Sozzo, five Sherlocismus Enervatus: In Vindication of some Great Truths Opposed, and Opposition to some Great Errors Maintained by Mr. William Sherlock.*

מפתח בית משה

או

סין לתורה:

Hoc est Domus Mosaicæ Clavis: five Legis
Sepimentum.

Authore *Josepho Cooper* Anglo, in *Octavo*.

A Vindication of some Passages in a Discourse concerning Communion with God, from the Exceptions of William Sherlock Rector of *St. George Buttolph-Lane*. By *John Owen*, D. D. in *Octavo*.

A brief Declaration and Vindication of the Doctrine of the Trinity. By *John Owen*, D. D. in 12.

THE
JOURNAL
OF
THE
ROYAL
ANTHROPOLOGICAL
INSTITUTE
OF GREAT BRITAIN
AND IRELAND
VOLUME 10
PART 1
1880

CONTENTS
PAGES
The Human Skeleton in the Cave of Vindija, Croatia, by
Prof. G. Hensley, F.R.S., and Mr. J. H. R. Murray, F.R.S.
The Human Skeleton in the Cave of Vindija, Croatia, by
Prof. G. Hensley, F.R.S., and Mr. J. H. R. Murray, F.R.S.
The Human Skeleton in the Cave of Vindija, Croatia, by
Prof. G. Hensley, F.R.S., and Mr. J. H. R. Murray, F.R.S.

THE
JOURNAL
OF
THE
ROYAL
ANTHROPOLOGICAL
INSTITUTE
OF GREAT BRITAIN
AND IRELAND
VOLUME 10
PART 2
1880

CONTENTS
PAGES
The Human Skeleton in the Cave of Vindija, Croatia, by
Prof. G. Hensley, F.R.S., and Mr. J. H. R. Murray, F.R.S.
The Human Skeleton in the Cave of Vindija, Croatia, by
Prof. G. Hensley, F.R.S., and Mr. J. H. R. Murray, F.R.S.
The Human Skeleton in the Cave of Vindija, Croatia, by
Prof. G. Hensley, F.R.S., and Mr. J. H. R. Murray, F.R.S.

